1-1-1992

Internal and external factors influencing change in an urban high school : a case study.

Lorraine Julia Mary Carcerano
University of Massachusetts Amherst

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS INFLUENCING CHANGE IN AN URBAN HIGH SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation Presented

by

LORRAINE JULIA MARY CARCERANO

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1992

School of Education

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS INFLUENCING CHANGE IN AN URBAN HIGH SCHOOL: A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation Presented

by

LORRAINE JULIA MARY CARCERANO

Approved as to style and content by:

Robert Wellman, Chair

Mohammad Zaimaran, Member

Warren Schumacher, Member

Bailey Jackson, Dean
School of Education

This study is dedicated to my hero,
my Dad

Louis Carcerano

1907-1981

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deep appreciation is extended to the participants in this study, whom the promise of privacy does not allow me to mention by name; they are representative of countless dedicated people from within and associated with this urban high school as partners in education. The changes in this school certainly could never have come about without their support and commitment. This study has given me an opportunity to reflect on my own experiences within the school community and has given me an understanding of what is really important in the world.

Acknowledgements go to my chairman, Dr. Robert Wellman, for his generous contribution of time and insight in developing the idea of the study, and to members, Dr. Reza Zaimaran for his patient guidance through the technical maze and Dr. Warren Schumacher for his sensitivity in providing crucial feedback.

A special tribute is extended to my family and close friends who have been a source of loving support for my ongoing growth and development; in particular, thank you

to my parents, Louis and Pamay, whose love always inspires me.

to my son Lawrence, whose optimism and kindness always lifts my spirits.

to my dear Jack, whose good humor encourages me not to take life so seriously.

Thank you for all the days and all the ways you have been there for me.

ABSTRACT

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS
INFLUENCING CHANGE IN AN URBAN HIGH SCHOOL:
A CASE STUDY

MAY, 1992

LORRAINE CARCERANO, B.S., BOSTON STATE COLLEGE

M. Ed., BOSTON STATE COLLEGE

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Directed by: Professor Robert Wellman

The purpose of this study is to document change at an urban high school in order to analyze the impact the different variables of the school culture have on the process of change.

The study is based on the theoretical assumptions of effecting change through a process of responding to teacher and student needs to improve morale and responding to school needs to improve public perception. The process of change is reconstructed through in-depth interviews with representatives from within and from outside the school, i.e., partners in education, who were participants and observers: they represented teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and the university partner.

The data was analyzed using as a framework Fullan's three phases of the change process: (1) initiation, (2) implementation, and (3) continuation in order to determine the influences the different variables have on the process. In accordance with the literature in educational leadership, the educational leader can play a central role by creating an environment of change and empowering teachers and other members of the school community. This study corroborated those findings in the sense that the headmaster was a central person in the change process and he enabled people to promote change through power-sharing and empowerment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of the Study

> . . . schools have the capacity to improve themselves, if the conditions are right . . . . School Improvement then is an effort to determine, from without and within, conditions under which the adults and youngsters who inhabit schools will promote and sustain learning among themselves (Barth 1986, 293).

We have tried everything conceivable to improve our schools. For those of us who have been involved with education for twenty or more years, we have seen reform efforts come full circle, only the educational jargon is different: merit pay of the 60's now appears in career ladder programs, decentralization is now school-based management, the voucher system is now schools of choice. For the most part, it is widely acknowledged that schools remain unchanged, or, possibly worse, due to the "impact of constant change on the culture and the spirit of educators" (Deal 1990, 6).

The effects of constant change were manifested in the late 1970's and early 1980's at an inner-city high school in Boston, Massachusetts. The following excerpt is from the BSSP/School-Based Team Project Report (Spring 1982) describing the symptoms of the problems:

. . . the problem the school was having with students roaming the corridors. These students were a constant problem and made it difficult to have an effective and efficient teaching climate at the school. They were a continuous annoyance in that they used the corridors as an area of recreation. There were problems of smoking (this often included marijuana), frequent interference with classroom teaching, constant noise, fights and thefts. Students would race through the corridors, knock over lockers, start small fires and generally be disruptive. The situation became one which was too much for the security staff to handle alone. It was affecting the morale of the whole staff and students and teachers alike were becoming demoralized by the constant harassment and abuse. The situation had become uncontrollable and something had to be done (BSSP School Based Team Project Report, Spring 1982).

I choose to say "symptoms of the problems" for I do not want to convey that the students are to blame; they are the victims. The teachers, too, are the victims. That is not to say that students and teachers are blameless; <u>everyone</u> has contributed to the problems as manifested in this school and in many inner-city schools around the country. As Sizer (1983) stated, "The weaknesses of the high school lie deeper, in how it is organized and in the attitudes of those who work there" (Sizer 1983, 23).

This study is based on the assumption that, just as <u>everyone</u> has contributed to the problem, <u>everyone</u> should contribute to the solutions to change in our schools. Change did begin to take place.

This is a case study documenting the change process as it reveals the school culture and the determinants of the school's power to change. It is a human-oriented approach to school change as advocated by Lightfoot (1983), Sizer (1985), Boyer (1983), Goodlad (1983), Sarason (1982), Lieberman (1988). The approach involves looking at an educational institution as a "complex social organism," as referred to by Terrence Deal in acknowledging the human realities of schools (Deal 1990, 6).

It is widely acknowledged that schools cannot effect change alone; the support of partners in education, such as the university and business partnerships that are now commonplace throughout the country, has been documented as invaluable to schools. This study intends to support that contribution; but the process of people working together is not without its unique problems. Therefore, this study intends to contribute to existing knowledge about the complexity of "differing cultures clashing" through interactive experiences (Sarason 1982). This study strives for objectivity by reflecting not only on the successes but the problems and constraints experienced in the change process. This is a study of people and relationships, people who created a culture that was

conducive to change. Effecting change first at the school's "unique personality level" provides the conditions for addressing problems at a deeper level, e.g., educational programs (Tye 1985, 372).

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to document one kind of school change in order to analyze the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change in an inner-city high school. It is, essentially, a process of effecting change first at the school's unique personality level, its atmosphere, climate, culture, ethos, which provides the conditions for addressing problems at a deeper level.

A background review of the literature provides an understanding of major theoretical positions regarding the change process and the culture of schools. An analysis of models of school change establishes that there are many agents of change from within and outside schools, that there are varied means of effecting change, and that the culture that contributes to change is unique.

This study is based on the theoretical assumptions of effecting school change through a process of responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve staff

morale, student morale, and public perception. Specifically, the period pre-change and the following ten years of the change process is reconstructed through in-depth interviews with representative participant / observers: teachers, support staff, administrators, parents, and the university partner, eliciting data that is revealing of:

1. the style of the headmaster
2. the role of teachers
3. the extent of university / business involvement and parental / community involvement
4. the interactive process of constituents.

Then, the data collected from the questions in the interviews will be analyzed using as a framework Fullan's (1991) three phases of the change process: (1) initiation, (2) implementation, and (3) continuation (to include outcomes) to determine the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change (Fullan 1991, 47-48).

Rationale and Significance of the Study

Much has been written concerning the need for change and what to change in our schools, but little appears to have been written

regarding the actual process of change and the role of school culture in the process. The need has been expressed by the noted educator Sarason (1982):

> . . . a major barrier to our understanding of the school culture: the lack of systematic, comprehensive, and objective description of the natural history of the change process in the school (Sarason 1982, 34).

and by Theodore Sizer (1985):

> . . . the problem of how to describe the unquantifiable--the inspiring qualities or energy of some teachers, the courage of some students, some communities and parents--remain unaddressed and invisible (Sizer 1985, 207).

Sarah Lightfoot (1985) expressed a need for

> . . . more information about the culture of secondary schools and the daily experiences of the people who inhabit them, that we need descriptions of life in schools that conveyed pictures of them, and that these portrayals needed to be relatively unencumbered by theoretical frames or rigid perspectives (Lightfoot 1983, 9).

School reform efforts of the past, according to Deal (1990),

> . . . have concentrated on correcting visible structural flaws . . especially around instructional issues. Such . . . changes overlook more durable and stable cultural values and mind-sets behind and beneath everyday behavior . . . which provide meaning and continuity . . . more promising approaches [reflect the symbolic side of schools . . . making schools better places for teachers, students, and administrators (Deal 1990, 6-9).

The Review of the Literature offers differing viewpoints of the change process in schools: the role of the principal as the major change agent versus the role of school culture and other change agents in effecting change. This study attempts to provide data to document the relationship of the factors and their effect on change. It describes one kind of change in the natural setting of an inner-city high school beset with problems, and, intends to contribute to a greater understanding of the impact of relationships and the role of culture in effecting school change. The descriptions are revealing of the "formal and informal structure" of the school which gives educators a comprehensive view of the school and its interrelated parts (Sarason 1982, 37). Its findings are useful for practitioners, providing insights into specific local problems or conditions and the process leading to improvements.

Chronology of Events

Pre 1968	White-Jewish neighborhood All female population, predominantly White, gradual assimilation of minorities Nearly all female, older faculty and headmaster
1968	Assassination of Dr. Martin Luther Klng, Jr. Neighborhood rioting / White flight from the neighborhood

1968-1972	Black student population Enrollment of young men New, young teaching staff / Male assistant headmaster became headmaster
1974-1976	Beginning of desegregation More diverse student body assigned Financial and human support increase by school department Highly social student / teacher relationships
1975	Beginning of business partner involvement
1976-1981	Reduction of financial and human support by school department Rising student discipline problems / conflict between American Black students and West Indian Black students
1981	Mid-year retirement of long-time headmaster Assignment of new headmaster
1981-1982	Assignment of third headmaster High staff / student turnover Escalation of student / staff problems BSSP / University of Massachusetts work group attempt at change Beginning of grade 9 cluster / computers
1982-1983	Beginning of the change process with a new headmaster More administrative / security support Beginning of building / facilities rennovations School collaborative established / influx of agency support University support strengthened with the gifted and talented program Business support strengthened Special education department strengthened

	Beginning of annual Thanksgiving dinner for the elderly
	Beginning of reviving senior class activities, student activities, school activities
1984	School's 50th birthday celebration with university and business support
	Library rennovated with business support
	Beginning of the school improvement council
	Beginning of supportive enrichment classes: SAT review class / college prep class
	Beginning of more students going on to college
1985-1990	Beginning of the student support team
	Beginning of after school academic support program and in-house alternative program
	Rising West Indian population
	Rising Asian population
	Beginning of the transitional program
	Beginning of the peer leadership program
	Adoption of the computer magnet theme
1990	Arrival of the Cape Verdean bilingual department
	Beginning of the Admissions Guaranteed Program / tutors / 9th grade guidance class with the university partner

Definition of Terms

change process involves, or is based on, the most fundamental . . . assumptions determining three general types of social relationships: those among the professionals within the school setting, those among the professionals and students, and those among the professionals and the different parts of the larger society (Sarason 1982, 59).

climate encompasses both physical and social aspects of the school: a divine set of properties that would

	communicate to students that schools are pleasant but serious workplaces designed to help him achieve (Dwyer 1987, 38).
communicate	to convey or transfer something tangible (Webster 1967, 161).
community	an interacting population of various kinds of individuals . . . in a common location (Webster 1967, 161). In this study, it includes parents, agencies, the university and business partners, the school system, and the media.
control	skill in the use of a technique (Webster 1967, 182).
empowerment	to be given the necessary responsibility that releases . . . potential and makes . . . actions and decisions count (Sergiovanni 1987, 121).
ethos	the symbolic side of schools and classroom (Rutter et al. 1979)
influence	the act or power of producing an effect without apparent exertion of force or direct exercise of command (Webster 1967, 433).
interactive	mutual or reciprocal action or influence (Webster 1967, 440). Interactions are first and foremost social. And because they are social, interactions involve language, both verbal and nonverbal (Vacca 1989, 5).
morale	a state of psychological well-being based on such factors as sense of purpose and confidence in the future. (Webster 1967, 550).
partnership	voluntary and sustained interventions among organizations or their subunits (Jones and Maloy 1988, 126).

power-sharing	the extent to which leadership roles are shared; principals view themselves as principal-teachers and teachers view themselves as teacher-leaders (Sergiovanni 1987, 122-123.)
process	a natural phenomenom marked by gradual changes that lead toward a particular result (Webster 1967, 678).
school culture	values, beliefs, and expectations that teachers, students, and others share (Sergiovanni 1987, 124). the symbolic side of schools and classrooms: ethos (Rutter et al. 1979), climate (McDill & Rigsby 1973, Halpin & Croft 1962).
vision	a blueprint of a desired state . . . . It is an image of a preferred condition that we work to achieve in the future (Sheive and Schoenheit 1987, 94).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

I am exploring and making a critical analysis of some significant models of school change and theoretical positions of leading educators, inasmuch as they relate to this study, in order to gain insight into:

1. The influence the different variables of a school culture have on change in a school:
   a) The extent of leadership style
   b) The role of constituents.

2. How school culture emerges and is influenced by the variables.

3. How major theoretical positions are reflected in the models.

This review serves as background to my study; evidence of the commonalities as well as the points of divergence in the findings raises issues that give direction to my study: an analysis of the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change in an inner-city high school.

Much of the literature centers on the principal or headmaster as the key agent of change. The following schools are representative

of various styles of leadership that effect change. The authors, through observation and interviews, describe each principal's own personality style and talents as a leader. Each principal has a vision of what education is; the means of conveying that vision to students, staff, and "significant others," and the impact of their relationships are documented by personal observation and interviews. The majority of the schools in the review are similar to the school in the intended study: they are predominantly Black, inner-city schools; they are located in the poorest area of the city; the majority of families are headed by a single parent and are on welfare; and the numerous issues to be addressed are those that are associated with most inner-city high schools. Many of the problems associated with education apply to all schools--whether they are in urban or suburban areas, and whether they are reflective of predominantly Black or predominantly White populations.

Models of School Change

Eastside High School / Joe Clark

Perhaps the most controversial was the principal of Eastside High School in Paterson, New Jersey--Joe Clark. Arriving at the school of 3200 predominantly minority students in 1982, he found a

school: "crawling with pushers, muggers and just about every other species of juvenile thug (Bowen 1988, 52). The building was in a state of disrepair: broken windows, damaged doors, graffiti-marred walls. Teachers were afraid to come to work. The summer prior to the opening of the school year, he prepared the school--and community--for his arrival by personally supervising the physical clean-up of the exterior and interior of the school. On the opening day of school, he greeted arriving students with the demanded expectation of keeping the school vandalism-free. More than his physical presence in the hallways intimidated students; his infamous baseball bat and bullhorn made his presence reverberate throughout the building. He established an autoctratic, discipline-oriented vision of education; he affirmed, "Discipline is the ultimate tenet of education. Discipline establishes the format, the environment for academic achievement to occur" (52). His discipline ranged from the physical (a keep-to-the-right-and-keep-moving rule for the corridors, a dress code) to school policy (tardiness or cutting class received latrine or graffiti-scrubbing duty). He "threw out" hundreds of students for being tardy or absent or disrupting the school and called them "leeches and parasites" (52). But, when

brought up on charges of insubordination for suspending so many students, he was supported by two busloads of Eastsiders.

> His biggest fans, the students at Eastside, say they see in him the father figure that so many of them do not have anywhere else. His love for them is evidenced by regular meals out with groups of twelve of them where they can bring him problems, ideas, and gossip" (Chapelle 1989, 125).

His treatment of teachers was sometimes severe. In a consistently autocratic style, he dismissed or "encouraged to leave" those who did not agree with his vision; over 100 teachers left the school (52). He often challenged and reprimanded teachers in front of students.

According to Clark, his first year was spent putting the school in order; the second year of Clark's plan was "to instill pride in the staff and students" (Chapelle 1989, 125). He believed that--first, school pride must be developed; then, individual students would acquire self-pride. He began by changing students' perception of the building, their athletic teams, and their school song (mandating that it be memorized and sung on demand). Students were singled out daily for accolades over the public address system--and, were singled out, as well, for retribution of offenses. He reminded students and teachers, daily, of the need for order and pride in self

and school. "Without these reminders," he emphasized, "the board of education, administration, staff and students would not turn the tide" (125).

Clark was heralded nationwide through the media for his tough approach to the problems in schools. Critics contended that he was also losing students to more violence in the streets, jail, and minimum wage jobs, if any. Others contended that just stopping violence was a quick-fix to problems, but it was not a solution to solving the complex problems in our schools. One measure of whether the approach was successful or not may be determined by looking at the academic accomplishments of students: math scores went up slightly (6%), but reading scores "barely budged" (remaining in the bottom third of the nation's high school seniors); students who went on to college rose from 182 to 211, while the dropout rate rose from 13% to 21% (Bowen 1988, 55).

Carver High School / Norris Hogans

When the superintendent of schools in Atlanta was planning to close Carver High School, calling it "an ugly reminder of the deterioration, chaos, and unrest that plagues many big-city schools," the community rose up to defend it, saying, "It's not much, but it is

ours!" (Lightfoot 1988, 31). Norris Hogans, an energetic, ambitious, young principal from a nearby elementary school, was appointed to take up the challenge.

He was described as "powerful in stature and character" . . . dominates the school . . . in perpetual motion, looking severe and determined, always carrying his walkie-talkie" (33). Hogans strongly felt that "order is a precondition for educational progress," and applied that philosophy to both teachers and students (44). With an autocratic and sometimes offensive style, he stressed tough standards of behavior and conformity to structure. "No deviations or improvisations [were] tolerated". . . there was "little room for self-expression and professional autonomy" (43). Some teachers "welcome the imposed order, the new sense of collectivity, and the big-daddy, paternalistic image of a take-charge principal" (43). Others "tend to keep their complaints to themselves . . . passively resisting his attempts to make changes by preserving their own inertia" (34). Although order, structure, an atmosphere of caring and concern seemed to be the prerequisites of a productive education, they did not inevitably lead to academic excellence or inspired teaching, as concluded by Lightfoot when she observed the school

(37). Hogans simultaneously recognized the need for the teachers in the school to be more energetic and to inspire students. But, the realization that these qualities could not be imposed, that they had to be generated from within the teachers, "continues to be beyond the reach of Hogans" (44). His "meaning" attempts to provide "nourishment" for his teachers amounted to: giving them breakfast every morning, not having meetings after school (except one highly organized meeting per month), and not requiring them to patrol hallways (44). His decisions were ultimate and non-negotiable.

Connecting to Business Resources. Hogan's vision was for a comprehensive education for students, one that combined the academic and vocational programs offered at the school. Hogans surrounded himself with an "inner circle" of close friends, mostly administrators, who took care of the "every day details" which freed him to carry his vision beyond the school to gain outside support and commitment of resources (34). Much of his efforts were directed at redefining the image from "the dumping ground" of the city to a school where students would "clamer to be admitted" (40). It was this network of connections to the world of work that accounted for Carver's unique character.

Most of the teachers were understanding of the neglect of internal affairs as a trade-off for the benefits he obtained from outside resources. Students were less understanding and complained of "his seeming disregard for their need for attention" (41). Still, "the vast majority of students say they come to Carver in order to learn salable skills and gain entree into the work world" (45). The Work-Study Program placed approximately 150 juniors and seniors in skilled jobs throughout Atlanta. It was a highly selective program that matched students with the work setting. Students were recognized in a public event called Free Enterprise Day whereby their work accomplishments and goals were acknowledged. It was the intent of the program to reinforce a new ideology for Blacks--that they could overcome the exclusion and oppression that previous generations had met.

The trips to downtown Atlanta began with a unique program initiated by Hogans. All tenth graders became members of the Explorers Program of the Boy Scouts of America. Each month, wearing white Explorer jackets and travelling as a group, the entire class was bussed to the major businesses to explore how they functioned and the careers that they offered. The intent was, not

only to motivate students but to help them make more informed curricular and vocational choices in the eleventh and twelfth grades. With the first graduating class after the program's inception, Hogans saw "striking differences in the graduates understanding of the work world, their career choices, their determination, and their dedication to achievement" (48).

The connection to the business world was facilitated by a strong commitment, developed out of mutual admiration and trust, between Hogans and a vice-president for community affairs for a major trust company in Atlanta who coordinated the school relationship with the business community. Both agreed that "more revenue flows from these independent connections than comes from the school system's budgetary allowance" (50). The two leaders shared the same vision of seeking out connections of influences and resources for Carver. Less clearly drawn were the contributions of university resources. The need had been established; the academic program needed revitalization, new ideas, and clearer goals. Lacking, too, were close connections between the school and family/community. These were some of the additional challenges that faced Carver.

Seymour Sarason (1982), in his widely read books on culture and change, acknowledged another dimension to the crucial role of the school leader:

> The evidence is rather clear that although it is true that the principal is the gatekeeper in regard to the change effort, the ultimate outcome depends on when and how teachers become part of the decisions to initiate change (5).

One means of mobilizing constituents to become leaders has been through School Improvement Teams (SIT)). The principal builds from the SIT base and empowers the representatives of the constituents to be leaders of committees to define and to carry out school improvement activities with other members of the school community. The SIT concept may originate within the school itself to bring staff members together or to bring outsiders into the school to share expertise and responsibilities. There are countless configurations of the concept and as many descriptions of the roles of participants in the process.

Stagg High School / Administrative and Teacher Leadership

Stagg High School was a model of the SIT concept within a school by school staff with the administration. The uniqueness of the Amos Alonzo Stagg High School change movement was that it

was conceived and initiated by classroom teachers and it was they who remained the moving force behind its efforts. As their first step, the core group of eight teachers and four administrators undertook reading and discussing literature on the process of change: "teachers' and administrators' roles and expectations . . . how it would affect those roles . . . and difficulties schools face in implementing change" (Foster 1991, 27). For a year, discussion revolved around change, in the abstract, without being specific about what to change in their school. The second year, through grant money, the core group expanded to 25 teachers, counselors, and administrators who expanded on the readings and discussions of roles, expectations, and change. Now called "The Instructional Leadership Team," members became the on-site change agents; they continued to read and discuss and contacted consultants for "leadership training, conflict resolution, and decision-making" (27). The rationale for the two years of planning was to develop the skills necessary to become successful change agents and to establish a "climate for change" (28). But, criticism from those outside the group, who called them "all talk and no action," spurred them on to begin taking action on change (28). The group chose a "safe area,"

with which they were somewhat familiar, to practice their decision-making skills--the master schedule and site budget and confined themselves to the mechanical aspects, i.e., number of sections of classes.

At the end of the second year, the team, confident and ready, opened the group to the entire faculty. The first planning meeting brought out more than 50 percent of the faculty (28). Brainstorming on school problems that needed attention, it was determined that "self esteem of students and staff, public relations, school maintenance and beautification, and school-university partnership" were the areas of focus (28). Subcommittees were formed to generate solutions. A full day of released time was provided to committee members to develop action plans. The value, according to the author, was that . . .

> faculty began to talk about change . . . began to plan change, and to carry through action plans, and to recognize that change was needed . . . . [the school] had established some new social norms and was creating a climate for change" (28).

The school did not begin with a vision as advocated by literature; that began three years into the process with brainstorming and drafts of the school vision and new organizational

structure. Then, the process continued with sharing, discussing, and revising with parents, community members, the business and professional community.

After almost three years, the vision became the foundation for the restructuring effort in "curriculum, governance, and fundamental belief system--all at the same time" (29). Numerous problems were cited in the process, which made implementing change "difficult"--a faculty of 73% over the age of 45, ("only 7 of us were under 35") who were "set in their ways" and "not generally risk takers" (28). Other problems were related to the principal, who, at times, felt that the team was . . .

> usurping his authority, or was reluctant to relinquish the final say on some issue for fear of being held accountable if the team's decision didn't work out. Teachers who believed they had decision-making power were sometimes told their input was only advising. Each of these dilemmas led inevitably to misunderstandings and confrontations. (28).

There was also difficulty in communicating with the central administration who viewed the school with suspicion when not kept informed of what they were doing. The principal was then caught in the middle:

> If he supported the central administration, the teachers cried foul and accused him of not buying into shared leadership; if he

> supported the teachers, the central administration suggested that his faculty was out of control (28).

A three day retreat at a conference center on the beautiful northern coast of California brought all participants together (teachers, administrators, classified staff, central office administrators, board of education members, parents and community members, and students) to discuss the changes that they needed to make their vision a reality. The rejuvenation, energy, and enthusiasm was obvious; the major task of sustaining this attitude and translating them into action lies ahead.

Outside Support to Staff / Personal and Professional Renewal

Leading educators are contending that it is the experts in the schools, the headmaster and teachers, who can provide the answers to how to effect change (Goodlad 1983, Sizer 1985). Reform cannot be imposed from outside schools, but support is needed from all constituencies of society. Goodlad (1983) summarized that symbiotic process:

> Improvement of schools will take place slowly if reforms are thrust upon them. The approach having most promise is one that seeks to cultivate the capacity of schools to deal with their own problems, to become largely self-renewing. This self-renewal will be difficult without support from the school's surrounding constituencies (Goodlad 1983, 31).

The impact of outside constituencies has been documented through the countless number of collaborations and partnerships that have sprung up around the country over the past ten years. Some have been considered more successful than others, but all have been valid attempts to address problems in schools.

Support from the business sector has been described as a major factor in the change process at Carver High School in Atlanta, Georgia. It was this connection to the world of work that contributed to the unique character of the school. The business support directly benefited students by connecting them to the world of work. Teachers benefited more indirectly: as students saw the connection of schooling to the world of work, the more meaningful the experiences in the classroom became.

University support to schools is now commonplace throughout the country--the major focus has been, and still is, in providing direct services to students in the form of early intervention and motivational programs in attempts to curb the dropout rates and better prepare students for higher education.

Not as common are the collaborations and partnerships between universities and schools who focus on activities with

school staff to effect change through personal and professional renewal programs. James Vivian (1986) of the Yale-New Haven Institute Collaborative focused university support to teachers in the pursuit of mastery of their subject area and in the development of strategies for teaching to students. Boyer (1982) advocated that teachers design university /school programs themselves, with universities helping "on the teacher's terms" (Boyer 1983, 20). Boyer also cautioned institutions about creating "structures within which we operate with resources flowing into that structure" (19). When structure or resources cease, possibly programs will not be able to exist. Gifford, from the SUPER Project (1986) added--what is required is . . . "a large commitment of varied resources--especially human ones" (Gifford 1986, 78).

The following models of school change are representative of partnerships with an emphasis on human resources. With university support of people in schools to make changes from within, change efforts may have a greater chance of becoming institutionalized after outside resources have been disbanded.

BSSP / University of Massachusetts, Amherst. The Boston Secondary Schools Project was a graduate degree program operated

collaboratively by the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts / Amherst and the Boston Public Schools. As of 1985, teachers and administrators from 25 metropolitan Boston secondary schools were working with university faculty as school improvement teams with a focus on school-based change.

Teams from secondary schools in Boston were eligible to participate in the BSSP, and individuals were expected to work with a team until the dissertation stage of their doctoral programs. Those who did join had a two-fold interest in improving (a) their school, and, (b) their own personal professional development (Maloy and Fischetti 1985, 165). Teachers and administrators received graduate credit for the on-going work of the team as part of the university graduate degree program.

Members of the teams analyzed their own schools, then developed and implemented improvement projects:

> Their improvement projects typically focus on student motivation and performance, parent involvement, school climate and staff communication, curriculum reorganization and minority students' readiness for higher education (165).

The teams then evaluated their effectiveness and shared their findings with other teams. University faculty participated as team

members and provided assistance with "team building, project planning, and the application of research findings on school improvement" (165).

The analysis of the experiences of the 5 year period revealed that some teams were more effective than others, "even though they focused on similar school improvement agendas" (165). Through a detailed review of collective observations and written and oral assessments of reports and experiences of participating members of teams, the university participants found a pattern that determined team effectiveness:

> The attitudes of team members toward teamwork and school change . . . predict the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the school improvement efforts of each team (165).

Roosevelt Schools / University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

The University of Massachusetts / Amherst, School of Education worked cooperatively with a school system similar to that of Boston in 1982, the Roosevelt Union Free School District in Long Island. The district had changed from a predominantly White population to one with 93% minority population by 1977 (Jones and Maloy 1988, 58). The school district was characterized by staff isolation and low staff morale due to staff turnover as a result of a most unstable

school administration (five superintendents and six principals at the high school). It was a school system in desperate financial straits when Ulysses Byas took over as superintendent. Over the next six years, through sound financial and curriculum decisions as well as his charisma and personal presence in the schools, the school system began to improve. The partnership between the school system and the university was borne out of the school system's desire for better schools and a recognition that the university could provide that support. The program developers focused on teacher professional growth and personal renewal as the means to affect student achievement. Through individual and small group discussions, school staff expressed their framework for change:

> . . . useful changes depended on the quality of interactions between teachers and students. They stressed attitudes of openess to children and their families, to new ideas and approaches, to other staff members. Overall, they expressed little concern for curriculum methods that preoccupy teacher preparation programs (61).

The instructors from the university emphasized processes rather than outcomes; they encouraged open communication among members to lead to consensus decision-making in problem-solving. Some of the school plans focused on non-curricular problems, e.g., to

foster a positive school climate, parents and community interactions with schools, and roles and responsibilities of students in decision-making. Those who were involved in the schools felt that they were "achieving much with minimal resources" (63). Teachers began to feel that they were capable of effecting change.

There has been an inherent problem when schools and universities meet--there has been a general mistrust by school people of "academic elitism" of university people and a "university-level disdain for a lack of research and theory among . . . [school] staff" (66). It is acceptable that both will focus on activities that are most in line with their own interests. Although there were only about 20 participants in the course work at the university in graduate degree programs, staff felt that the program had affected the district. The effects of the program extended to many activities initiated by participants with other members of the school community.

What was important was, that teachers "recognized that they had knowledge essential to facilitate school improvements" (67). The early mistrust of university people was overcome when school staff reached the point that they felt empowerment to effect change.

Unfortunately, much of what has been written in literature about the barriers to university / school collaboration played itself out at the university: some were highly critical toward teachers as researchers and their reform efforts; many were uncomfortable with the topic of school improvement and even interacting with practitioners; elitist attitudes and academic superiority was evidenced (68). In summary, the bureaucracy treated teachers as students rather than professionals; therefore, the partnership was not expanded. Those enrolled in degree programs individually negotiated with the university to fulfill degree requirements.

SUPER: University of California, Berkeley. The SUPER project (School-University Partnership For Educational Renewal) of the University of California, Berkeley and 16 public schools, had as its goal "institutional change at both the school site and within schools of education that will encourage lasting improvements in educational practice" (Sosniak 1989, 12). Specifically, its goal was to develop "practice-sensitive researchers and research-sensitive practioners" (12). Acknowledging the traditional "differing cultures" (Sarason 1982) of the two institutions as barriers to communication, Bernard Gifford, Dean of the School of Education,

still felt that both the college and schools had a great deal to offer each other. High level institutional agreements legitamized the pairing, but the partnership "emphasizes direct and continuous contact between the faculties" (12). Through hands-on workshops and seminars that addressed topics suggested by teachers and of interest to college faculty, they mutually shared leadership, presentation, and discussion roles. "School liaisons" and "Fellows" (teachers who worked with the project) were paid stipends to conduct school site meetings regarding work in progress or future work (13).

A unique feature of SUPER were the Collaborative Research Projects which were "typically suggested by university-based educators, although school based educators were encouraged to submit ideas for research" (13). They were judged by a panel that represented both institutions in respect to how useful they were to the classroom teacher. If funded, the university professor was linked to a particular SUPER school, was paid for a half-time research assistant for one year, and was provided with one month salary to further research. The professor had to agree to work directly with the teacher; the teacher had to be included in early

stages of defining the research; and feedback had to be given back to the teacher and school about the research project. Four research projects had been funded each year for three years, and one had been given further funding: the SUPER-EI Cerrito Ninth-Grade Research Project provided an opportunity for collaborative curriculum development with a focus on students at-risk for school failure (13).

The project was not without its problems: teachers found it difficult to do research after a day of teaching; they also found it "uncomfortable to make changes to their established patterns of teaching" (15). College faculty found live experimentation a very time-consuming process which slowed down their research pace and forced changes in their established patterns of doing research. Both were in agreement in their concern regarding institutional rewards for being part of the project. Both felt that there was a lack of understanding and misguided perceptions from those in administrative positions. Even so, all concerned found it worthwhile to continue the project for another year.

It still has not been established if the SUPER Project has developed practice-sensitive researchers and research-sensitive practitioners.

New Haven Schools / Yale, James Comer. James Comer (1988) contended that in large urban cities as many as 50% minority children drop out of school, thus making them the least likely to have the social and academic skills that the jobs in current service and technology industries demand (Comer 1988, 42). In 1968, James Comer and colleagues at Yale University's Child Study Center started an intervention project at two inner-city schools in New Haven, Connecticut with a focus on supportive bonds that draw together the students, parents and school rather than a focus on academic concerns (42). That is not to say that academic concerns were ignored; the strength in supportive bonds for minority children effected improvement in academic performance and a decline in truancy and disciplinary problems when the study was evaluated in 1980. The twelve year involvement with the two schools emphasized the long-term commitment required by collaborators to effect change. The two schools, the Martin Luther King Junior School, a kindergarten through fourth grade school of 300 pupils and the Katharine Brennan School, a kindergarten through fifth grade school of 350 students, were 99% black and almost all poor. The pupils ranked near the bottom in achievement and attendance among

the 33 schools in the city and had serious problems in attendance and discipline. The staff was so discouraged that the turnover rate was 25%. The parents were characterized as dejected, distrustful, angry and alienated.

The first year of the project was approached by staff and parents with "high expectations" but lacked "clear goals and strategies," which resulted in furthering dissention between staff and parents and with students (44). But, James Comer, as director of the project, along with a social worker, a psychologist and a special education teacher from the Yale Child Study Center with their strengths in the social and behavioral sciences were able to assess the social dynamics of the groups. They revealed the basic problem underlying the dismal academic and disciplinary record of the schools: "the sociocultural misalignment between home and school" (44). They began by recommending to both groups that the structure of regular meetings to coordinate plans and set goals was needed. A goverance and management team comprised of twelve people, led by the principal and made up of elected parents and teachers, a mental health specialist, and a member of the non-professional support staff, was formed to address issues ranging

from the academic to social programs to school procedures. Initially, the teams were neither fully accepted nor effective because the Yale group was viewed as outsiders. In time, as factions began to see benefits that affected them personally, they were more willing to put into practice the expertise of the Yale group. One suggestion involved encouraging the principal to see that "power-sharing" increased his ability to manage the school (47). The benefits experienced by teachers and other administrators, the sense of empowerment to effect change in matters that personally affected them, laid the foundation for change to begin.

Parents became active members of the team. They shaped policy and actively participated in school activities with students; some became paid classroom assistants. School social activities became the foundation for fostering good relations between staff and parents so that when a child had problems, the matter could be discussed without defensive reactions from either party. As more parents began to attend school activities, school climate and student behavior improved (47).

A major goal in working with the staff was to increase a working understanding of child development. The many levels of a

child's development, e.g., the "social, psychological, emotional, linguistic and cognitive areas are critical to academic learning" (45). The child also brings with him to school the attitudes, values, and behavior of the family; "its social network strongly affect . . . development" (45). The school represents mainstream values; the better the child meshes with these values, the better he will be able to succeed, according to child development psychology. When social skills are considered appropriate by the teacher, more positive reactions are elicited, developing a bond between teacher and student. The meshing of school and home fosters this development. According to Comer (1988):

> . . . . such lack of development or development that is at odds with the mainstream occurs disproportionately often among children from the minority groups that have had the most traumatic experiences in this society: Native Americans, Hispanics and blacks (45).

Minority parents, on one hand, have looked to the school as their only hope for the future of their children; on the other hand, they have expected school to fail them just as other mainstream institutions have failed them (46). Often, these sentiments have been conveyed within families from parents to children, and have further alienated the bond that parents can provide to nurture the

teacher/child bond that can support development and learning. Thus, begins the cycle associated with the viewpoint that school is unimportant and academic success unattainable: behavior problems, dropping out, pregnancy, drug abuse and crime.

The Comer study suggested that the

> . . . . key to academic achievement is to promote the psychological development in students, which encourages bonding to school. Doing so requires fostering positive interaction between parents and school staff . . . . (46).

With the help of the mental health team (the school psychologist, the social worker, and the special education teacher), shared cooperative effort addressed student behavior problems. Through its delegate on the school governance team, patterns of troublesome behavior were shared with other team members to effect changes in school policies and practices to better address students developmental needs. Through their intervention, it was found that staff became increasingly sensitive to the concerns of developing children (47). By 1975, the program was clearly having an effect: "behavioral problems had declined . . . relations between parents and staff had improved . . . the intelligence of the children had become manifest" (48). By 1979, in contrast to the 1968

findings, the program had produced significant academic gains, e.g., students in the fourth grade had caught up to their grade level. By the early 1980's, the fourth grade students ranked third and fourth highest in the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Attendance at King was either first or second in the city, with no serious behavior problems at either school in ten years (48).

The success of the program was attributed to three key ingredients: the governance team, the parents' program, and the mental health team. When the Yale group left in 1980, the program was "fully integrated into the normal practices of the staff who continued to carry it out" (48).

The program has now been implemented in more than 50 schools around the country.

Conclusion

Since the early 80's, attention has been directed to the state of education through many National Commission Reports, e.g., A Nation At Risk (1983). The fault of such reports, according to many leading educators, is that they stress "organizational changes" of various kinds, e.g., the structure of schools (Tye and Tye 1984, Deal 1985). Deal (1985) cautions:

> The tendency to use National Commissions recommendations for organizational change as 'blueprints' for changing schools will meet with the same frustration as all past efforts at change (Deal 1985, 154).

Tye and Tye (1984) add that the National Commissions fail to address the underlying issues--"one of which is the nature of the flow of communication and knowledge to, from, and within schools" Tye and Tye 1984, 322).

Deal (1985) continues, "Commissions cannot control the process of change; their reports are typically silent about how the process should proceed" (Deal 1985, 150).

It is for these reasons that more must be written by people in the schools and about change that emanates from within schools. The models of school change in the Review of the Literature have been written by people who have either been involved with schools in change processes or have interviewed and / or observed people involved in change processes. They serve as background for my study of a change process as recounted by the people who are representative of the population who effected change by dealing with their school's unique problems.

The models of school change cited in the Review of the Literature illustrate processes of change through varied styles of effective leaders who, with varied success, have attempted to break down the barriers of isolation within schools and without.

Representative of the countless studies done on "effective principals," Dwyer (1984) reported in a three year study by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development:

> While studies indicate that effective educational institutions have strong leaders, the qualities and characteristics identifying a strong leader are not clear. We found no single image or simple formula for successful instructional leadership (Guild 1987, 21-22).

It is evident from the Review of the Literature that change has been documented in schools with strong leaders. Two of the strong leaders reviewed who have effected change in schools have been described by others as autocratic leaders. The trend in more recent literature is on leaders who effect school change by allowing others to take on leadership activities among their peers. Each leader has his own style of communicating his vision of education to others in schools. Sergiovanni (1990) has summarized the countless studies of leadership in successful schools (Lightfoot 1983, Lipsitz 1983, Dwyer et al 1984, Peters and Waterman 1982, Deal and Kennedy

1982, Bennis and Nanus 1985, McGregor Burns 1978, Vaill 1984) :

> What leaders stand for and believe in, and their ability to communicate these values and ideals in a way that provides both meaning and significance to others, is more important than how they behave (Sergiovanni 1987, 116).

Autocratic leadership style raises issues regarding the extent and depth of change when it is evident that there is: (a) a lack of sharing and open-communication with teachers, and, (b) opportunities are not available for teachers to interact with each other or with the administration. This study intends to explore the issue of empowerment at the high school level and to add to research in this area through concrete descriptions of processes and activities.

There is a preponderance of literature that precedes Barth's (1990) assertion that change must emanate from within, with those most closely associated with the school. John Goodlad (1983), Tye (1985), Lightfoot (1983), and others support the single or individual school as the most effective unit for successful change. This involves decentralization of authority from the top (downtown administration) and giving decision-making authority to people within schools--those who best understand their unique problem--to

come up with the solutions. This theory, the "bottom-up" approach advocated by Bulloughs (1985), is now the cornerstone of the restructuring movement that is sweeping the educational world. This study intends to explore the extent of control the headmaster has over what he can change in the school and what the constraints are from inside and outside the school. The roles of finances and the central administration are also explored.

The models of school change raise the issue of the role of culture in the change process. "Culture," as defined by Lightfoot (1983), is--"belonging to a greater whole" (Lightfoot 1983, 339). This sense of community applies to both teachers and students. According to Sergiovanni (1990): "Values, beliefs, and expectations that teachers, students and others share . . . define the culture" (Sergiovanni 1987, 124). Therefore, the process of <u>interactions of people</u> is important to the concept of culture (116). This study intends to "create a portrait" of an evolving school culture that is conducive to change (Lightfoot 1983, 5).

The school's relationship to the community is evidenced in various ways in the models of school change. Schools often in the poorest section of cities or towns reflect the problems of the

surrounding community. The immediacy of addressing the most obvious problem, physical deterioration, which is symbolic of the state of the school, is the common first step on the road to change. Comer (1988), Goodlad (1983), Boyer (1983), and others have spurred the movements to mobilize parents, community agencies, universities, and businesses to become active participants in supporting change efforts. The challenge of conveying a new image to the public is the beginning of the process of instilling pride and self-esteem in members of the school and those associated with it. This study describes the process of meeting that challenge.

The importance of parental / community support to schools that is most evident in current literature has been a position advocated since the late 60's by James Comer (1988). The success of the Comer Model with the New Haven schools is resulting in its replication in communities around the country. The model stresses to educators the importance of understanding the psychology of child development, of developing bonds with the family and community for support, and of developing personal bonds with students as elements of the foundation for academic learning. The structural value of group meetings, formation of teams, interaction among internal

staff and internal staff with outsiders to share ideas, set goals, coordinate plans in order to benefit all concerned in the total development of children is documented. It is also evident that change does not "just happen;" there must be a form of structure to effect change. Therefore, this school's models of structure to bring people together is explored. This study intends to explore the process of developing bonds among constituencies. Through a description of interactive activities, this study supports an added dimension to education that goes beyond academics.

Business and university support can take various forms: they may be supportive in directly servicing students through on-site activities at the college and business sites; or, they may be supportive to staff in fulfilling their needs at many levels. The problems associated with "differing cultures clashing" have been well documented by Seymour Sarason (1982) and experienced by all who have undertaken partnership activities. This study adds to that documentation through one school's experiences of what has worked and what has not, and will, hopefully, enhance future partnership outcomes.

The ultimate intent of this study is to explore the process of change at this high school and the roles of the change agents in effecting change by responding to staff needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve staff morale, student morale, and public perception. The data describes the roles of the change agents, individually and interactively, which is then analyzed to determine their influence on the process of change.

Limitations

The purpose of this study is to document one kind of school change in order to analyze the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change in an inner-city high school. Although there are many facets of change in a school, the focus is within the framework of three identified areas: the process of responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve teacher morale, student morale, and public perception. The study describes the individual and interactive roles of people from within and outside the school.

The number of staff interviewed is limited due to voluntary and involuntary staff turnover during the prechange years. There have been few university personnel who have had on-going,

consistent involvement with the school. In lieu of a university partner representive, the representative of a university program who has served that purpose through her on-going, consistent involvement with the school since the beginning of change is a participant. The parent was actively involved with the school just prior to the change period and for four years into the change period and has maintained informal involvement to the present. There have been very few parents who have been actively involved for a period of time; and, due to the transciency nature of the population, few are accessible. Although there are only seven participants interviewed, according to the methodology being used, in-depth interviewing, the "sample participants " . . . all [who] experience similar structural and social conditions gives enormous power to the stories of a relatively few participants" (Seidman 1991, 45).

This is a study of change at a single school. Barbara Benham Tye (1985) and others have concluded that . . .

> the most effective unit for successful and appropriate change is the single school, its teachers and administrative team (and sometimes students and parents) supported by the district, working together to identify and solve problems of concern to all (Tye 1985, 16).

As evidenced in the Review of the Literature, there may be similarities of problems and change efforts in schools; there are also differences which make each school unique, due to "particular combination of circumstances" which readers of this study must take into consideration before generalizing research findings (16).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this case study is to describe one kind of school change in order to analyze the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change. The method was selected in order to understand "the life cycle or an important part of the life cycle of the unit" being studied (Best 1989, 92). This case study, from an historical perspective, is largely a narrative description and analysis of the change process that took place over 10 years at a predominantly Black inner-city high school in Boston, Massachusetts. The process is reconstructed mainly through data gathered through in-depth interviews with representative participants from school staff, administration, the university partner, and parents.

Methodology of Data Collection

As background for the study, literature was reviewed with special emphasis on the concepts of school culture and the change process. Models of school change were reviewed and analyzed

regarding the different variables that have had an impact on change in schools: leadership, school staff, university / business partnerships, and parental / community support. The review provides the background for the emphasis of this study: to study and analyze the influence of the different variables of a school culture in effecting change by responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve teacher morale, student morale, and public perception.

Design of the Study

The method of gathering the data consisted of:

1. Interviewing four representative members of the school staff (two teachers, one teacher / administrator, one support person), one representative of the university partner, and one parent who reconstructed their experiences in the school relative to school issues and the process of change. The headmaster was interviewed to reconstruct his experiences in preparing for the job, his vision for the school, and his perspective of the process.

2. Reviewing recorded data of participants and organizing the data by themes relative to the process of effecting change by responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve teacher morale, student morale, and public perception.

3. Analyzing the data within the framework of Fullan's (1991) change process in order to determine the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change.

Selection of Participants

According to Seidman (1991), "The primary way a researcher can investigate an educational organization, or process is through the experience of the individual people, the 'others' who make up the organization or carry out the process" (Seidman 1991, 4). Due to staff turnover (voluntarily or due to budget cuts), there are approximately 15 accessible members of the staff who have been working at the school over ten years. Three staff members are representative of the accessible population and reflect the school population: two males (one White teacher / administrator, one White support person, one female Black teacher. The fourth staff member, a White teacher, is representative of 50% of the staff who began with the new administration. They were selected using a "purposeful sampling" technique according to the "maximum variation" approach (42). In striving for objectivity, the headmaster, a Black female parent, a White female university partner representative were also interviewed.

According to Seidman (1991), "The method of in-depth, phenomenological interviewing applied to a sample of participants who all experience similar structural and social conditions gives

enormous power to the stories of a relatively few participants" (45). A contact visit was made with the participants to initiate the process of informed consent. The participants were informed that they would be given pseudonyms and that the information that they provided would only be reported with the data of other respondents. The nature and purpose of the study, how he or she fit into it, the rights and privacy of the participants were discussed and insured verbally and in writing through a consent form according to 7b of the doctoral forms.

The Research Method

In-depth interviewing as a research method has been advocated by Seidman (1991) as "a good way . . . to learn about people and schools" (xiv, i). Fundamental to in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience. An added dimension is "putting people's behavior in context with the lives and experiences of others" (i).

The design of the approach, a series of three interviews of approximately 90 minutes in length and spaced out over a period of time, is attributed to Dolbeare and Schuman (1982):

> Interview 1: The intent is to put the participant's life in context by asking him to tell as much about himself as possible regarding the experiences that led him to this job.
>
> Interview 2: The intent is to concentrate on reconstructing concrete details of the participant's experiences relative to the topic. Stories of the details of his experiences in the context of relationships with others lays the foundation for the purpose of the third interview.
>
> Interview 3: The intent is to elicit reflection and meaning of the experiences (pp. 10-13).

The interview guide (Appendix) lists the questions to be asked in the desired sequence. It insures that the significant information desired is elicited, thus establishing "content validity" (Best 1989, 203). The interview guide standardizes the situation by exposing all participants to the same interview situation (Borg and Gall 1979, 312). The aim of the open-ended questions is to encourage participants to reconstruct and reflect on their experiences from an individual viewpoint and in relationship to others.

The method allows for "alternatives to the structure and process" (Seidman 1991, 15). Seidman (1991) adds, "As long as structure is maintained that allows participants to reconstruct their experience within the context of their lives, alterations to the three-interview structure and duration and spacing of the

interviews can certainly be explored" (15). The interviews build on each other, which is a measure of reliability of data, i.e., consistency of response (Best 1989, 203). Validity is established by scheduling interviews on separate occasions and checking for internal consistency of what was said.

Participants were interviewed from within and from outside the school to elicit connections among their experiences. Tape recording the interviews reduced "the tendency of the interviewer to make an unconscious selecting of data favoring her biases" (Borg and Gall 1971, 315). The tape recorded data were played back often and studied more thoroughly, thus affecting the reliability of the study. The evaluation and classifying of the data was done immediately after the interview. At a later date, based on playback of the interview, evaluation and classifying of the data was done again and compared with the immediate evaluation to achieve greater reliability.

Data Analysis

The recorded interviews were reviewed and transcribed. The elicited data from various perspectives were studied for thematic connections and organized into categories. The general strategy for

organizing and analyzing this data was based on my "theoretical propositions" of effecting change by responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve teacher morale, student morale, and public perception (Yin 1984, 119).

A pilot study was conducted with an individual from the accessible group, but outside the participant group, in order to evaluate and improve the guide, the interview procedure, and to gain experience in using the procedure, recording the interview, and evaluating the data produced (Borg and Gall 1971, 319).

The data was analyzed using as a framework Fullan's (1991) three phases of the change process to determine the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change:

> Phase I: variously labeled initiation, mobilization, or adoption consists of the process that leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with change (Fullan 1991, 47).
>
> Phase II: implementation . . . doing, getting, and supporting people who are acting and interacting in purposeful directions . . . . (83). Key themes in successful improvement efforts have been identified as: vision-building, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking and empowerment, resource and assistance mobilization, and problem-coping (81).
>
> Phase III: called continuation, incorporation, routinization or institutionalization--refers to whether the change gets built in as an on-going part of the system or disappears as a result of a decision to discard or through attrition (48).

The analysis includes what is consistent and what is not consistent with current literature. Conclusions are made regarding the influence of the different variables of the school culture on the process of change and recommendations.

CHAPTER IV

CASE STUDY OF SCHOOL CHANGE

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to document school change in order to analyze the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change in this inner-city high school.

Identifying the Problems

A review of the 20 year prechange period, describing the school and its inhabitants in the context of events happening within and outside the school, is necessary in order to understand the issues that brought the school to its deplorable condition as manifested during the late 1970's to early 1980's.

John Goodlad (1983) in the Study of Schooling found that "young people get caught up in the values, problems, and vices of adulthood at an early age" (Goodlad 1983, 88). He continued, "Peer group interests other than academic were near the surface in all schools; in a few they had virtually taken over" (89). The manifestation of student problems in the school is a reflection of the problems of society. The effects of a changing society, a changing community, a changing school population had become

manifest in this school and effected low morale in staff and students and negative public perception.

John Goodlad (1983) acknowledged "the school as a system of interacting parts, each affecting the others (31). The beginning of this study will explore the evolution of the problems from within and from outside the school that became barriers to the educational process. The prerequisites for school change have been supported in change studies:

Jones and Maloy (1989) were representative of educators who have seen a "safe and orderly environment as a means to student achievement and social responsibility" (Jones & Maloy 1989, 12). The basic needs for safety and discipline apply to students and teachers.

Boyer (1983) was representative of countless studies in leadership who found that "In schools where achievement was high and where there was a clear sense of community . . . invariably, that the principal made the difference" (Boyer 1983, 219). Strong leadership conveyed a vision--a sense of direction--that fostered trust and positive interactions among people.

Sarason (1983) expressed a need for the redefinition of roles of constituents--teachers and others--by the school leader in the planning and implementation of change efforts:

> The available literature in educational change efforts points to the principal's crucial role, especially in regard to the seriousness with which he or she redefines the role of teachers in planning and implementation. The implications of that finding for the redefinition of parents and other community groups in matters of policy and change should be obvious (Sarason 1983, 295).

The role of the headmaster and the redefinition of roles of people within and associated with the school will be explored in the process of effecting change at this school.

John Goodlad (1983) acknowledged the "shift in balance between home and school" that accelerated in the 20th century (Goodlad 1983, 4). The school increasingly took over the responsibilities of others: (1) teachings traditionally taught by parents and (2) counseling services. New roles emerged for those within schools as they interacted among themselves and with those from outside schools who came to be known as partners in education: i.e., parents, community people, and the university and business sectors. A need was established at this school to create a mutual internal / external support network for students and teachers.

The Process of Change

An understanding of the issues lays the foundation for the emergence of the data evidence that supports the assumptions of this study: effecting change by responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve staff morale, student morale, and public perception.

Responding to Teacher Needs to Improve Morale

According to Barth (1990), "relationships among adults in schools are the basis, the precondition . . . that allow, energize, and sustain all other attempts at school improvement" (Barth 1990, 32). The process of the headmaster in giving direction to meeting the needs of teachers--from the basic needs to higher order needs, personally and professionally, will be explored.

The process of nurturing a shared common vision for the school and its constituents will be revealed through the individual and interactive roles of people in sharing a common purpose. According to Sergiovanni (1987), through

> 'leadership by purpose' . . . teachers respond to work with increased motivation and commitment when the leadership conveys that their work is important, of value, with a emphasis on the process and being given public recognition for their work (Sergiovanni 1987, 121).

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

The role of the headmaster in mobilizing resources from within and from outside the school to respond to student needs are crucial in the change process. James Comer (1988) and the Yale -New Haven schools project stressed the importance of building "supportive bonds" between the student and his home life with school (Comer 1988, 42). The evolution of the processes of: supporting students holistically in resolving the personal problems that affect academic performance, taking the students out of the isolation of the school environment, and fostering relationships between adults and students and among students peers, are significant factors in the bonding process to school. Lightfoot (1983) captured the dilemma facing the school:

> Schools need to provide asylum for adolescents from the rugged demands of outside life; at the same time they must always be interactive with it. Without the connection to life beyond high school most students would find the school's rituals empty. It is this connection that motivates them (Lightfoot 1983, 32).

The process of responding to students needs through a focus on the personal and professional development ot teachers, the successes and constraints, will also be explored. The influence of

the university and business partners in this initiative reaffirms James Vivian (1986) and others who found that "teacher leadership is . . . indispensable to educational reform" (Vivian 1986, 59).

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

Tye (1985), described the viscious cycle of low morale in schools and public perception of such schools:

> . . . morale declines . . . . This is exacerbated by the negative images of the school conveyed to the public by the mass media, which notoriously neglect the small daily and weekly triumphs of hard-working teachers and focus instead on school problems and conflicts (Tye 1985, 390).

This study will elicit data that is revealing of the formal and informal structure of bringing people from within and from outside together to influence and sustain change efforts. It will reveal the process of a shared sense of purpose by all constituencies in the process of responding to school needs to improve public perception of the school and the image of people within and associated with the school.

John Goodlad (1983) is representative of countless educators who have spurred movements to mobilize community agencies, universities, businesses, and parents to become active participants in "cultivat[ing] the capacity of schools to deal with their own

problems, to become largely self-renewing" (Goodlad 1983, 31). The focus is also on the importance of "human resources" to effect change (Sosniak 1988, 78; Gifford 1986, 78). The ultimate goal of change is to institutionalize the process and outcomes of change efforts.

The role of the headmaster and others in identifying and enlisting resources and assistance to carry out the visions of the intended direction of the school will be explored. Sergiovanni (1987) spoke of the leader "building organizational patriotism:" building commitment and loyalty to the work of the school as a means to bond people together by developing a shared covenant and common culture" (Sergiovanni 1987, 129).

The process of change is reconstructed through the following interviews with representative participant-observers from within and outside the school which will be revealing of individual initiatives and the interactions of the variables that influenced school change. The participants are representative of teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and the university partner whose viewpoints span a ten to thirty year period.

Teacher / Administrator Interview

Thomas is a graduate of a large, religious college. Influenced by a college history teacher, history became his major. After a stint in the army, he turned toward the field of education, earning a Master in Education degree, with history as a major. As a city resident, he took the mandatory city teachers' exam, taught for a year as a provisional teacher, then became a permanent teacher at this school where he began his teaching career 29 years ago. He preferred to remain a classroom teacher, but, accepted an honorary assistant headmaster title bestowed by Mr. Love.

Identifying the Problems

In 1962, when Thomas reported to his teaching assignment of three English classes and two history classes at this school, he was surprised to find that it was an all-girls school. Although he grew up in the same urban city, he never heard of the school in this area 12 miles from his neighborhood.

At the time, the school population was predominantly Jewish since the school was in a traditionally Jewish neighborhood. Although there was open enrollment in the city, there were few Black and Asian students since most students attended their neighborhood schools by choice. With the closing of a high school that year in another area of the city that was attended by predominantly Black students, more Black students began to enroll in the 9th grade class in this school.

As Thomas reminisced about his first year teaching, he attributed the biggest problem that he had to deal with--the girls not listening-- to his being so "loose." The old saying, passed from teacher to teacher, of "not smiling 'til Christmas" was true; "I smiled way too soon," he added. His first few years he did not consider his best years as a teacher; he thought of them as a learning process of adjusting to an all-female environment and establishing discipline. The classes were much larger, 35-40 students; nobody was absent; everyone did her homework. The students were more demanding, which meant that one had to work harder as a teacher. Once in a while, if a student became pregnant, teachers were in shock. There were not as many single parent homes and parents were more involved in their children's education. Parents' meetings, after school hours, were mobbed.

The faculty was made up of older, single women, many of whom had been teaching at this school since it opened in 1934 as the most modern school in the city. As one of a handful of male faculty and the only one under the age of 50, he was treated like a son by everyone. He recalled being admonished by an older, female teacher for being in a room alone with a student. The headmaster, who was

also female, was tough! There were rules, and exceptions to rules were not tolerated. She was very unapproachable; a teacher did not go to her office unless summoned. She was neither visible in the office area nor around the school.

As the 1960's progressed, the community began to change--the Jewish population was moving out and the Black population was moving in; therefore, the school population began to change. By 1967, Thomas recalled that his homeroom was comprised of about 50% Black and 50% White female students. But that, he felt, was not what precipitated the ensuing years, 1968-1971, becoming the "worst years" in the history of the school. That era began in April 1968 with the assassination of Martin Luther King. Jr..

The day after his death, there was a riot in the neighborhood that enveloped the school. By mid-morning, the school was surrounded by thousands of chanting Black youth, hundreds of whom broke into the school, running through the corridors, breaking windows, stealing pocketbooks. After 3 terrorizing hours, the police got through the crowd to escort the teachers out of the building and the neighborhood. The school was closed the following week, which was followed by the spring vacation week. According to Thomas,

when school reopened, "You couldn't get through the front lobby [filled] with parents wanting to transfer their children out." When school reopened in September, 1968, the only White students who returned were the seniors. Not only had almost all the White students transferred, most of the Black students, who were just as fearful, had transferred also. The remaining White families moved out of the neighborhood, many of whom became the absentee landlords of the incoming Black residents. As a result of the tumultuous ending to the school year, possibly 30 of the older teachers retired; others had enough seniority to transfer to other schools. The new faculty were younger, new teachers--teachers who were what Thomas was like six years earlier. But now, the students manifested different problems.

The tough headmaster had already retired prior to 1968, and was replaced by another female administrator who found the uncontrollable situation overwhelming. She was transferred to an administrative position in the school administration office and replaced by the male assistant headmaster who remained in the position for the next nine years. According to Thomas, it was a period of adjustment for those who chose to remain: "I think we

were all going through the problem of thinking the school was like it was 10 years earlier, and it wasn't."

By the early 1970's, 90% of the population of the school was made up of youngsters from the housing projects with the manifestations of the rising social problems: poverty, more single parent homes, pregnancy, and drugs. There were not support staff, as yet, to deal with the new problems. Therefore, it was a learning process for teachers--learning how to deal with the problems themselves. In 1972, boys enrolled--which turned out to be an asset. Although there were only about 40 male youngsters who enrolled in the school by choice, their presence seemed to have a stabilizing effect on the atmosphere of the school. Time was diffusing the anger in the community, but the early 1970's marked the beginning of the struggle to involve parents with the school.

The best years he saw in the school, Thomas recalled, were the first few years after the bussing mandate--1974-1976--the beginning of desegegation. The high concentration of students that came from the housing projects was dispersed and a more diverse population was assigned. The school department just "threw money at us to spend," added Thomas. The school had so many young

teachers; the problem of having so many new, young teachers in the late 1960's now turned into an asset. They now had several years experience and were still young and enthusiastic enough to become involved in activities with the students. There were week-end ski and camping trips, after school field trips; the school now had football and basketball teams. Although the White students who were sent here were in the minority, there were very few racial incidents. The Black students never put pressure on the White students; in fact, at the start of any confrontation, other Black students intervened to ameliorate the situation. When bussing first began, even if there was a racial incident in another school, the White students at this school would not come to school the next day because they thought that there would be retaliation. But, when that did not happen, their fears were dispelled. By the middle of the year, they felt very comfortable in the school and ignored what was happening elsewhere in the school system. But, the area surrounding the school would keep most White students away. There was a very active parent with whom Thomas and other teachers worked in attempts to involve parents in the school; she was the "driving force," according to Thomas. A core group of parents and teachers

tried various strategies to try to involve more parents by scheduling meetings on various days and at various community sites. Few parents ever showed up and the momentum of carrying on efforts when the key parent left, dwindled. There was some involvement with community agencies; "it wasn't that they didn't want to be involved--they just had a lot of other things that they wanted to do," according to Thomas. Business partner support began in the mid-1970's, working, primarily, at finding jobs for students.

Through the 1974-1976 school years, the headmaster was given a great deal of support by the school department: money, human support--anything he wanted. Then, by the late 1970's, as bussing settled in, the school department started withdrawing both the financial and human support. The headmaster was left with one assistant headmaster; staff was cut back; and, there were fewer security personnel in the building. At the same time, the school department began appointing people to school administrative positions and the headmaster did not have a choice about it. The school's choices of deans of discipline for each grade, teachers on administrative assignments, were eliminated and replaced by one appointed person who was not a very forceful person, even by his

own admission. The school was falling apart again, from within. There were some attempts of outside support to effect change through Teacher Corps and the university partner. That program eventually was gone when funding was no longer available.

The school became re-segregated by the late 1970's, going from a high of 25% White to a handful of White students. Student unrest escalated; with the influx of the West Indian students, conflict arose between this new wave of immigrants and the American Black students. As classroom staff and teachers as supportive staff were cut back, the teachers began turning to the two-person administration for help as problems began to escalate. By 1980-1981, the nine year headmaster was unable to effect positive change as the entire school went out of control: the teachers began to feel that they did not have anywhere to turn for help as the students took over the building. The headmaster "left or got pushed out" and retired mid-year, according to Thomas. He was replaced for the remainder of the 1980-1981 school year by a Black headmaster, new to the school system from a suburban community. The school went from bad to worse as he remained detached from both staff and students, going out of his way not to deal with either

group. At the end of the year, he hosted a party at a local community agency site to thank the teachers who were doing so much in the school--but only sent invitations to the Black teachers. Thomas, who was not sent an invitation but obtained one from a security person, sent the letter to the school committee. Nothing was ever done about it. This headmaster only stayed until the end of the year and was then given another administrative title in the school department's administrative office. He left behind a divided faculty.

The 1981-1982 school year began with another headmaster, a long-time administrator in the school system. Although he was there only for a year, and the school continued going down-hill academically and discipline-wise, a glint of effort to effect change rose up from the ashes that year: the beginning of the 9th grade cluster concept and the introduction of computers into the school's curriculum. Thomas described the teachers as "a lot older," in their late 30's and 40's, having families and not as heavily involved as a group as they had been in 1974-1976. Some of the people who were a positive force in the school had left. The parties, trips, the positive reinforcement characteristic of those years were gone. But, some of the 1969-1971 core of the staff remained at the

school. By the end of the school year, there were rumors that the school was going to have a new headmaster--Mr. Love.

Beginning the Change

The change process actually began during the summer of 1982, prior to the opening of school. The new headmaster, Mr. Love, called Thomas, whom he had known for several years through their common interest in basketball, and asked him to meet him at the school. He wanted to talk to him for several reasons: he wanted to know as much as possible about the school and the people in it--and, he personally wanted to ask Thomas to be an assistant headmaster. Thomas considered himself an optimist by nature, therefore, he was still able to recount many of the positive aspects of the past twenty years and the people responsible for them, as well as an objective account of the negative aspects of those years. Thomas respectfully declined the promotion for personal and professional reasons. He was introduced to the two people whom Mr. Love brought with him from his former school to be the assistant headmasters: one, a female who would be in charge of curriculum issues and, the other, a male who would be in charge of discipline. Thomas recalled, "I felt that if they were his friends, and he could put whomever he wanted

[to be assistant headmasters] as opposed to having the ones appointed [by the school department], everything was going to be all right."

But, the teachers did not know Mr. Love or his administration and were not as confident; in fact, they were afraid. Thomas spent the summer taking their anxious phone calls and trying to assure them. The teachers persuaded Thomas to reconsider being a member of the new administrative team, on their behalf. So, with modifications, he took the position: he would do the job . . . but would not, officially, take the title.

At the first meeting with teachers, Mr. Love communicated that he would make the school a safe place for both staff and students. It would be their responsibility to teach. He was not the greatest speaker but his caring attitude came across.

Saying "No" to the students the first day, for example, about wearing hats in the building, communicated to them that there were rules to be followed. Mr. Love, a big man, 6'+, was not afraid to confront them; they were not going to roam the corridors or go anywhere that they were not supposed to go. He had many contacts in the community, the school department, and Judge ____'s office

(regarding desegregation): anything he asked for, he received. He brought with him the two assistant headmasters, and now Thomas as the unofficial third assistant headmaster, two deans of discipline, and more security personnel. In fairness to previous headmasters, he was given many more support personnel than his predecessors. There were about 6 students that he discharged and told them not to return. It was probably illegal, but it was something that had to be done and he did it. The majority of students perceived immediately that he cared about them and wanted to do what was best for them. Thomas added, "It was his force of personality more than anything." The teachers felt supported from the beginning--the students were out of the corridors and into the classrooms. "He gave the teachers a better controlled school--and, I guess, we can't ask for any more than that," Thomas concluded. A seemingly superficial change solved a problem and turned out to be a great work of art: on the main floor was constructed a gigantic graffiti board, the only place on which the students were free to express themselves with felt-tip markers.

Responding to Teacher Needs to Improve Morale

The teachers were hesitant to put their trust in the new headmaster, but it did not take long to see that he was a man of his

word: they did not have to worry about students cutting classes and roaming the corridors any longer. He was always in the corridors, stopping to have a few words with teachers along the way. He was interested in knowing people on a personal as well as professional level; he was always supportive and considerate of people and what was going on in their personal lives. Mr. Love personally covered many teachers' classes when something unexpected arose, rather than calling a substitute teacher.

Mr. Love was very sympathetic toward teachers; he truly respected and understood what went on in the classroom and the work that teachers did. Thomas added, "He's almost in awe of good teachers--maybe because he really wasn't a teacher himself." Mr. Love became certified as a teacher several years ago, with Thomas as his cooperating teacher, and continued to teach a history class for a few years.

He was always around the school; he functioned best informally. He was open to everyone, whether it was something positive someone had to say or some criticism, or a personal problem. Thomas added, "If anyone has something to say and doesn't it's <u>their</u> [sic] fault!" He was outstanding in that way, and his

assistant headmasters were all the same way--very open and caring. Mr. Love created an atmosphere that allowed teachers to break out of the personal isolation of the classroom. Thomas felt that . . .

> Inside the classroom, teachers seem to function in a vacuum from each other. But, the opportunities are there; he'll let people do anything they want. People are all over the place doing things.

The activities have been a vehicle for many people, even the complainers and cynics, to help the school; but even more, he added, "It's been good for <u>them</u> . . . . Some have become a more positive influence in the school . . . less cynical . . . less structured . . . . . They just step in and do it !" Some teachers have been very involved in fund-raising, all year round, to maintain what has become the traditions of the school: the annual Thanksgiving dinner run by staff and students for 1200 senior citizens, the school's participation in the annual district of the city parade, and a scholarship in honor of a long-time teacher who died unexpectedly. Student activities have been strongly endorsed with staff support: the awards banquet, the sports awards banquet, the graduation, the prom. Thomas added,

> There have been so many activities that people are involved in . . . . There are so many programs for students . . . . I think it's the age factor, again, . . . why we don't know about all of them. Maybe it's because we're just tired and don't bother with them.

A great morale-booster for teachers was The Cafe. People enjoyed going into the private dining area to have lunch with their friends:

> It was a terrific idea if he [Mr. Love] meant it that way--if not, it's still a great idea!; that has really done something for teachers; it has had a positive effect on the staff.

Mr. Love and his assistant headmaster were always trying to motivate the staff in meetings to discuss new ideas in teaching. Thomas felt that he was representative of other staff members who "listen[ed]--but the next morning . . . . " [the implication was, that it was forgotten]; again, he attributed the inability to make changes to one's teaching methodology to "age and lack of energy."

The best solution, according to Thomas, is to get new and younger teachers, which is not going to happen in the near future; the school department has been laying off teachers. The next best approach to getting the support of new ideas and energy is through practice teachers. The influx of several practice teachers and observers over the past few years was attributed to the outreach extended by Mr. Love to the area colleges. Thomas personally welcomed the challenging and exciting interchanges associated with being a cooperating teacher.

"As good as the headmaster is, there's much beyond his scope--so much beyond the scope of the school," said Thomas. He continued:

> I don't think he can do much more for the morale of the teachers than he does. Other things that affect our morale are beyond his control . . . our age . . . and the threat of layoffs and its effect on older people.

As an example, as recently as last week, the mayor of the city withheld the paychecks of teachers in a political ploy with the new superintendent. The threat of layoffs has been foremost in teachers' minds, but everyone in the school knew that the headmaster was going to do his best to retain him or her.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

Thomas did not want to be dean of discipline because, he admitted, he "would not be good at that job." Mr. Love agreed, and brought in others for that job, but added, that although he did not want him to be the disciplinarian, if he did see someone doing something wrong, he would have to send the student to the disciplinarian's office.

"I want you to be an advocate for the 'good kids'," was Mr. Love's directive. He introduced Thomas to each class at the opening

day student assemblies and announced, "If you don't know where to go or what to do, see Mr. _____." He wanted Thomas to be be there just for them, to make them more comfortable. Other ways of insuring that he would come in contact with almost all students was to put him in charge of the free lunch tickets, bus passes, and to have lunch duty in the cafeteria.

Causes of student problems have not changed very much over the past 10 years: transciency, lack of family structure (90-95% of the students are from single parent homes), and pregnancy. The cycle of children from single parent households has not been broken, even with the introduction of more outside agency support brought in by Mr. Love. Thomas estimated that he has known 30-40 mothers who attended the school and now have children of their own attending the school.

The school's ability to deal with student problems have changed due to a "more holistic approach as opposed to a more academically-oriented approach of earlier administrators," according to Thomas. Mr. Love, coming from an entirely different perspective--not being a teacher--had a broader awareness of each child's problems. The headmaster has done the best he could to keep

youngsters in school and to support them to graduate through the introduction of many in-house support progams and more liberal school policies.

In the early 1980's, Mr. Love asked Thomas to chair a new student support team with the school clinician for special education and a doctor from the community health center as the key member. The group, although concerned with academics, was more concerned with the social aspect of student problems. Thomas, for example, being in the cafeteria through all three lunches on a daily basis, saw the students who were always alone, those trying to find inconspicuous corners in which to hide. These students were the first candidates for the team members who tried to make them feel more comfortable in the school. This informal group, which was Mr. Love's initiative, was the predecessor of the state-mandated Student Support Team (SST) a few years later. The scope of the team eventually broadened into a more structured approach to include academic problems. It was the vehicle to address the problems associated with the growing number of immigrant students from English-speaking islands who were having difficulties because of lack of education. The students did not qualify for bilingual

education because, although many could not read English, they were English-speaking. Through the SST, two classes were created: a supportive English skills class taught by the English head of department and a history class taught by Thomas. After several years, the two classes expanded to a transitional program to include other subject areas.

In an effort to support students who were unable to function in a regular school setting, an alternative program was created within the school--Project Lifeline. It allowed students, who were usually bright but had problems that caused them to be 1-2 years behind grade level, to put in extra time and double the credit in order to catch up. For other students, students who failed a class in prior years and did not make it up in summer school, an after school program gave them the opportunity to make up academic classes and earn credit. The headmaster supported a waiver policy that allowed students to make-up work when the allowed number of days absent had been exceeded. The policy has been criticized by some teachers- but, Thomas felt that

> it [was] the humane and Christian thing to do; . . . . You must constantly remind yourself [as a teacher] of what these students have to deal with in their personal lives.

One strength of the school has been the one-to-one relationships between teachers and students. That strength began with Mr. Love in one-to-one, informal interactions with students. He has stopped students and has asked to see report cards; other students have been seen running to show him theirs, or running away to hide. He has been their father, their big brother; he has been their role model. The door to his office has always been open to everyone. Thomas concluded, "Mr. Love is the epitome of the need for a Black headmaster in an area such as this. Unfortunately, not all . . . can do it the way he does."

Mr. Love has fostered an appreciation for differing cultures. The newest group he welcomed to the school was the Cape Verdean bilingual department. The group has been a positive influence on the entire school: "They [the students] are more old-fashioned--although pregnancy is still a big problem--and have a strong work ethic," Thomas added.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

The university and business partners--"Just by helping the school, they help all of us . . . . The atmosphere of the school has greatly improved and that is reflected in everyone's classroom."

The program for the school's best youngsters was an initiative of the university partner--the gifted and talented program. Granted, the program has accepted only the best students, but it has done a wonderful job providing the enrichment that the school was unable to provide. The program director was the person who made the effort to become involved in the school as much as possible. She was a member of the School Improvement Council (SIC), the unofficial, "community breakfast," and was involved with the perfect attendance club and student field trips. She was responsible for the tutors being in the school, the guidance class, and the Admissions Guaranteed Program (AGP). As much as she was appreciated for her work and involvement in the school, she was also criticized because she was from an outside agency. She wanted to become more involved in other school matters, such as the tardy program, to address ways of getting students to school on time, but there was some reservation on the part of many members of the faculty. She was accepted for reasons such as: "It is her nature to do things . . . her personality . . . an age factor, again, accounts for her energy . . . . She's more a do-er than the rest of us," according to Thomas.

The partnership originally expanded because of the headmaster's personal involvement with the university; he was assistant basketball coach there. His connection made the partnership stronger than it was with previous administrations. The university supported the school in simple things: if any of our athletes were hurt, the trainer from the university helped them; the gym was used when visiting teams did not want to play in the school gym. The tutors that they sent to help students, obviously, helped the teachers by giving individual support to students who needed the most help. Many teachers received grants, which helped them in the classroom.

The business partner helped the school in many ways: many of our graduates were provided with jobs. The company provided guest speakers for classes. When the school's basketball team won the championship, it bought jackets for team members. Through its support there has been a sports banquet and an awards banquet every year. For staff, they offered workshops in computers and management; they payed for a substitute to cover the teachers' classes. They were involved in the school's 50th birthday party which was also the occasion of the company's 150th birthday. The

party was an important means to re-establish relations with the community and alumni; the positive publicity that the school received was most important in the early 1980's.

Parent involvement has always been difficult. At first, it was thought that the reasons were: parents were uncomfortable in dealing with teachers; parents were uneducated, therefore, uncomfortable; parents were old-fashioned. Now, Thomas' concluded: their lives are such a struggle; they are working; school and education is a secondary matter. For the past twenty years, meetings at various times of the day, week-days and week-ends, have been tried--at various community sites as well as in the school. Periodically, there was a parent was the driving force in outreach activities. Letters and phone calls were made to encourage parents to come to the school. There was an adult education program at the school for several years which made the school more accessible to the community. Parent meetings were scheduled on that evening, prior to the beginning of classes, thinking that parents would be coming here anyway. That tactic was not successful.

The school has been more open in recent years, before and after school, because Mr. Love--and many staff people-were in the

school for several hours prior to and after the school day. Attracting new students to the school, especially White students, has been difficult due its location, even though "outside perception of the school in 1991 as compared to 1981 was like a turn around of 180 degrees (based on Thomas' conversations with colleagues on the basketball circuit)." Now teachers say that they would like to come here to teach; the perception of the school has been considered the best in the city aside from the exam schools. The recognition of the football and basketball teams and the publicity about the school's computer program helped to change public perceptions of the school. Many people may have helped affecting that perception, in one way or another, but, added Thomas, "It's the headmaster who has done it! It's his personal contacts--his personality!" Everyone has started to hear about him now: he has been written about in newspapers, magazines; he has been seen on television. He has been nominated for all kinds of awards: Educator of the Year, The Reader's Digest Award.

Teacher Interview

Hope was born in a small town in the South. She was raised in a close knit family, her father being the sole provider when her mother died. At the start of her education in the local public schools,

Hope began a personal folder that followed her through high school. She began each year by articulating her goals, among which, was her career goal of becoming a teacher. She was most influenced by her high school chemistry teacher: she liked "the way she got kids involved in the classroom; she made you feel that you owned what you were learning." This philosophy, she felt, guided her own style of teaching. After graduating from a major southern Black college, Hope taught for three years in New York; then rejoined her family who had migrated to Boston. She began teaching in this city soon after.

Identifying the Problems

When Hope was assigned to the school in 1971, there was only one other Black member of the faculty. The teachers who had been retiring or transferring out in large numbers since 1968, due to the unsettling climate in the school and its environment after the assasination of Dr. Martin Luther King, were being replaced by a younger group of new teachers--many of whom are still teaching at the school. The staff and administration had difficulty addressing the anger that was still in students which manifested itself through fighting--fighting with those in authority as well as among themselves. "The predominantly White staff in a predominantly Black setting probably just didn't know how to deal with students: what to say, what to do, how far to go before they would be attacked," Hope concluded. She came to this conclusion through group faculty meetings where teachers openly expressed their

concerns. But, there was a camaraderie among members of this new group of teachers, which she attributed to the optimism associated with youth--"when you feel you can change everything and make everything right." The teachers were here to teach and they wanted to teach but recognized that they had to learn how to communicate with--and discipline--Black children. The voluntary sensitivity meetings after school, in which there was full participation by staff, marked the beginning of the improvement of the school climate. This movement coincided with the beginning of the desegregation mandate in the mid 1970's which provided resources to facilitate staff initiatives to sponsor activities that not only brought staff together but students together with staff. Getting staff and students involved in mutual activities became a major part of the solution to problems. With the desegregation mandate, there was an influx of a more diverse student body: more White students and more males (prior to this, a few males were voluntarily enrolling). Hope added, "The only way students feel comfortable in an environment, that they feel they belong, is through social activities." Once that was set in place, the fighting stopped, at least temporarily. If a teacher wanted to start a program or

activity, all teachers would get involved--people did not want individual recognition; it was, this is what the school is doing. The faculty was a working faculty--together. The business partnership began their involvement with the school and Hope temporarily left the classroom to take the position of liaison.

By 1971, the community surrounding the school that was once a Jewish community was now Black; therefore, the school population was predominantly Black with some Asian and few White students, but still all-girls. The students were in constant motion during the 1970's-- transferring or being transferred from one school to another. The teachers who were teaching mini-courses or extra-curricular activities after school became discouraged with the growing lack of interest shown by students, so the activities slowly were eliminated as the 1970's progressed. The students became increasingly disinterested in education and in preparing for their future, leading to a rise in behavior problems that both staff and administration felt unable to control.

Hope recalled early school outreach to parents: all teachers would become involved in the effort, calling parents by phone to encourage them to come to the monthly meetings. The teachers,

with the enthusiasm of youth and the attitude that they could create change, came back to the school for the meetings. They worked hard to get parents involved and they were successful in that effort for a few years. The passage of time changed her attitude, and she felt that she was representative of an older faculty that did not want to give the time up to come back to school for a school activity.

By 1981, the school became an "extension of the neighborhood," but, in a negative sense; people from outside the school came into the building at will. Faculty was, again, fearful of being in the building after school, therefore, after school programs were eliminated.

In the early 1970's, and again in the late 1970's, "when the social communication broke down, that's when problems occurred," Hope explained. She added, "The state of the school by 1980-1981 was the result of a "continuous breakdown of continuity." The nine year headmaster left and was followed by the coming and going of two more headmasters, leading to further frustration among staff and students. The continuous changes that the faculty had to meet, she continued, "no sooner getting organized with one change, then another change would be thrust upon them," was taking its toll.

There was resistance to getting together as a faculty anymore; either they "just let go" from one another completely or they formed little groups with their own agenda-demands hurled at each headmaster. The students attended school a while, then left, then came back--with some students, within the span of a day, with others, throughout the entire school year. The cycle of teachers transferring out of the school accelerated--although, as Hope reminisced, some of her colleagues who began their careers here about the same time as she did, remained, "hoping for a stronger, longer [sic] leader to bring the continuity back." There would be two more headmasters, one of whom was Black. Although she was beginning to feel that the school needed a Black headmaster, he was not the right headmaster for this school: he was not very visible in the school.

Beginning the Change

When Mr. Love arrived in the school in 1982, he communicated to teachers that he was there because he wanted to be there, that he was not there just for his job. He gave teachers that option, too; if they did not want to be there, they could leave. But, if they wanted to be there, they were to understand that they were there for the

students--"not directly saying that," according to Hope, "but, indirectly, by always focusing on what we could do to help the students." He gave the teachers a sense of security, a sense of wanting to belong. He allowed them to feel that this was <u>their</u> school. He provided security from the outside world of strangers coming into the building to terrorize people. He gave the teachers that sense of security that he was there for them, that he would allow them to do the things that were positive for children. From the beginning, teachers knew that he was sincere, and responded to him:

> Teachers became more willing to give out more, give more back, for they felt they were getting what they really needed. First, I saw the teachers change--as the teachers change--the students automatically change.

Amidst the problems of the previous years, the faculty that remained was the school's strength--although the members of the small group were now 12 years older. The 30+ new teachers that came with Mr. Love were more diversified: Black, White, males, females, young and old. He fostered a sense that <u>everyone</u> had something to contribute. He made the long-time faculty feel that they were part of the new direction. They had the ideas and wisdom

of experience, but, they "just got lost with [lack of] leadership." The coming of Mr. Love provided that strong leadership again, which was what the teachers needed to get focused on what they wanted to do.

Mr. Love made it clear that he was not there to tell teachers what to do. Hope reminisced, "he was like her high school chemistry teacher . . . . guiding, making others feel that they 'own' what they are undertaking." If a teacher had an idea for a program or activity, or a new approach to an issue--as long as it was workable for the school as a whole and to benefit the students, he never said "No." He believed that if anything was going to work, the person who was actually doing the work could make it happen. He did not take away the importance of the teacher; he allowed the teacher to present and carry out his or her own vision. According to Hope, morale became higher because of the way the school was run--"the teachers run the school!" They smiled more and talked to each other more, rather than staying to themselves, and worked together more as a whole.

The major change in Hope's teaching style came this year when she was asked to become the history teacher in the 9th grade cluster. She renewed her outlook on the important role of the teacher in the personal and academic lives of students. She

concluded, "You're the molder, in a sense . . . influencing their future." Working with 9th graders has made Hope more aware of the value of these early high school experiences that determine whether students stay in school and graduate, or drop out. The teachers in the cluster were supportive of each other in dealing with the students that they have in common. They met daily as a group to confer about the work and behavior of the students.

The AGP with the university partner worked with the cluster and supported teacher efforts. It had a motivational goal: if the students maintained a "C" average or better, they were automatically accepted to the university. They provided tutors to work with students who needed the individual help that the teacher might not be able to provide in the large classes of 30 students. The teacher of the guidance class worked closely with the academic teachers who have input on skills that they wanted to have students master, i.e., time management.

Hope has been at the school for 20 years and has seen the children of some of her former students--one of whom said to her recently: "My mother told me you'd be here . . . and to talk to you about this problem." She added, proudly, "They expect me to be here."

The more serious problems she referred to the SST--"They help us to help the students better; with the number of problems that the students have, we can never have enough agencies in the school."

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

Mr. Love came at the right time; the young men needed someone that they could look up to--the Black male role model that so many of our students are lacking. He became the father, the grandfather, the brother, the uncle, the teacher; whomever they needed in their lives, they found in him. Hope concluded:

> He understands them more--more than another administrator could--because he grew up in this neighborhood and went through some of the same things that these kids do.

She added, "He provided a sense of discipline--"as much as he could." From the beginning, she added, "You could see the students change right before you; he cared about them and he projected that . . . . the students knew; you didn't have to tell them."

The support services for students have changed; Mr. Love brought most of them into the school. They were necessary services so that the students could "find themselves": there has been something for everyone, according to Hope. The number of students who became pregnant has not changed over the years. Now an agency

representative has become a member of the SST to help the girls. Students have helped each other, too, in groups, on other issues such as grief support. Many students have elected teachers in whom they have confided, informally. Students could find answers to problems everywhere in the school.

Hope added, "It's wonderful! I think the cluster is the most important thing in the school." The AGP motivated students by offering automatic acceptance into the university with the necessary tutorial support provided to help them to reach that goal. When the students returned to class, they were ready to keep going, rather than falling further and further behind. The guidance class teacher addressed issues that supported the students in their classes and preparing for their futures: i.e. goal-setting and time-management. In the individual conferences with students, they became part of the process of self-analysis, which encouraged them to resolve their own issues.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

By the early 1980's, Hope felt that what the school needed was a Black headmaster. The school was going through a crises with the neighborhood; the students were getting involved in unlawful

activities outside the school and then carried them over into the school. The school needed a Black administrator who would stay after school to resolve problems or go out into the community to solicit outside involvement. Mr. Love was able to do that and he did. The school remained open in the afternoon because he was here; teachers remained, too, helping students academically or talking with them individually and/or in groups, or playing basketball. The school became a social center; students were not forced out of the building at the end of the school day. Many students and staff came in early in the morning; Mr. Love was here at 6:00 a.m., long before the official 7:30 a.m. opening.

Parents have been the most difficult to reach and to get involved in the school. In order to get parents involved, the effort must be consistent. Hope considered herself representative of other teachers who have not had the time, energy, or will to return to the school after school hours to sustain that effort. The most successful interactions with parents were at the very early morning meetings, before parents went to work. Many of the parents preferred to come to the school informally--and they were always accommodated.

The university and business partners have become members of the school community. The business partner helped by finding jobs for our students: more of our students have had jobs, not only in this area of the city but throughout the city and in neighboring suburban towns. It was through the activities with the community and the university and business partners that people changed their negative perceptions of the school. Every year the Thanksgiving dinner for the senior citizens in the community and nursing homes has been completely run by the staff and students. Politicians and media were always invited; therefore, the school received a favorable write-up in the newspapers. Many of our students have tutored in the local elementary schools as one of the peer leadership activities.

At first, the media just reported anything and everything negative about the school. The students themselves helped to change that tendency by asking reporters, whenever they were around, why they just reported the negative things that happened and would then proceed to tell them about other things of a more positive nature. The headmaster has attracted some important people in the newspaper and television media who have helped to

publicize the many positive qualities of the school. The school has become "the social school of the school department, they know how it looks inside, so it became a model--an ideal place to exhibit to people outside," according to Hope. Many politicians and celebrities have come here to initiate educational campaigns and programs and it has made everyone proud to be associated with the school.

Support Person Interview

John struggled to get through the 12 years of his elementary through high school education. With a weak foundation in reading skills, he felt he was always "playing catch-up to the other students." He graduated from a technical high school where he majored in cabinet-making. Upon graduation he enrolled in the air force where he continued taking courses to improve his English and math skills. His perseverence paid off; by the time he was discharged, he was ready for college. With the encouragement of his sister, he enrolled in a state college in the school of education for he was lacking the foreign language prerequisite for liberal arts. He majored in history with a minor in library science. He began his teaching career in a neighboring state, but with layoffs, returned to his home city where he taught at several middle and high schools. With an impending layoff again, he moved into his librarian certification area and took the position that was open at this school. He went on to earn a doctor of education degree.

Identifying the Problems

John recalled his first day in this high school in 1981, along with approximately 25 other new faculty members out of a total faculty of about 70: "Each of us got up to say where we came from; I

said that I was from the exam high school. And, I remember, everyone laughed!" He did not understand that reaction from his peers at that moment, but it did not take long to find out that everyone was communicating that he "had fallen from heaven into hell!"

The moment the students came into the building he knew that the school was definitely out of control. The students picked up where they left off the previous June: roaming the corridors, putting papers in broken lockers and starting fires so that they could get out of school, walking in and out of the building at will, smoking marijuana, bringing liquor into the building. There were always major fights--especially in the cafeteria--and the police were continuously called to the school to make arrests. Students came in just to roam the building and see their friends, then leave. It was impossible to keep track of who belonged in the school and who did not belong. When the administration or security approached, the students dispersed to other areas.

The library, in a sense, was John's safe-haven; he could lock his door, a luxury most teachers did not have. He soon found out that many teachers used the library for another purpose--they would send

their problem students there. He was ending up with up to 55 youngsters, each period--and they were not there to read books. John first tried to approach the headmaster about the problem, and got the message that this was the way it was always done; teachers have always sent students to the library. John proceeded to establish his own library-use policy, which he announced at a staff meeting and followed up with a written notice: only he would be giving out passes to students to use the library and the students had to make the request at the start of the school day. Many teachers just ignored the change policy and continued to send students, forcing John to have to send the students back to class. Other teachers verbally attacked him personally or at group meetings. John felt that he was battling the faculty; he also felt that the headmaster was somewhat cowardly in not backing him up. (John's yearly evaluation would later reflect that he was not cooperative.) John took his stand on enforcing his own policy so that he could get organized and do things that were meant to be done in a library--and there were some teachers and students who wanted to use it as such.

Teachers went from one extreme to another in addressing problems, whether it was this particular issue or other issues.

Sometimes they hid away and could not be found, not communicating very much at all. They had enough to do to deal with the problems in their classrooms; anything outside the classrooms was someone else's problem. At other times, according to John, especially at faculty meetings with the administration, they "scream[ed] a lot . . . throwing it all on the administration . . . . '<u>You</u> have to do something about it!" Leadership did not come from the administration; the headmaster and his assistant were very reluctant to make any moves toward change. In fact, they were not very visible in the school, just as the majority of teachers were not visible outside their classrooms. There were a few security people, but they could not be everywhere. Everyone looked to them to control the school. There was a pervasive atmosphere of individual isolation and fight for survival: people were concerned with "do[ing] their job and get[ting] out of the school as quickly as possible" and ". . . coming and going without being robbed or attacked," John observed. The other concern was, how to transfer out of the school as soon as possible. Staff was continually leaving: in 1981 there were about 25 new teachers; the following year, the year of the new administration, there would be 30.

John did not recall the faculty getting together as a group to address the problems. The individual members of the faculty senate, which John immediately joined, took turns on their unassigned period to "keep tabs on the real trouble-makers," as he described it. They compiled records: lists of discipline problems, incident reports on multi-page forms, and lists of suggestions to the administration regarding how to single out the serious problems. The lists were turned over to the disciplinarian, but it was unknown what became of the lists.

There was one more final attempt that year, through involvement with the Boston Secondary Schools Project (BSSP) and the University of Massachusetts / Amherst, School of Education. John, the headmaster, the nurse, and 5-6 teachers, as members of the program, met as a group with the intent to do something about conditions in the school. It turned out to be a year of study: "an attempt to understand what was wrong with the school--and there was lots to study," according to John--"that was our biggest achievement."

Did anyone from outside the school try to help? According to John, the relationship with parents was no different then than it is

now: very few would become involved; they were too busy working, too busy to be at the school. If there was involvement with the university or business partners, it was very little--not like it would be years later. "The school was pretty much written off," John stated. Some of the teachers addressed the problems in their individual ways: they painted their own rooms or made repairs; another teacher knew how to repair door knobs. "Everyone was an island in a sea of chaos," according to John.

Beginning the Change

No one seemed to have the solution as to how to deal with the problems until Mr. Love came along.

> He wasn't just an educator! He began in the criminal justice system; he knew some of the criminal types already and knew how to utilize the law and cooperation of judges and police . . . he knew them personally.

When Mr. Love met the teachers at the pre-opening day staff meeting, he told them how he spent his summer vacation. He had sent to every student--and parent-- who was assigned to the school a letter introducing himself and "laying down the law"--exactly how he expected every student to behave, as John recalled the headmaster's words. He would not tolerate weapons, drugs, liquor,

in school; he would have students arrested if anything illegal was found on them. He told the teachers, "I'll clear the corridors . . . the stairways . . . . I'll have the students in the classrooms. It will be your responsibility to teach them."

When school opened--the 9th grade came in on the first day, the 10th grade on the second day, and the 11th and 12th grades on the third--he brought each class to the library for a one hour lecture on the rules of the school. As students and teachers began classes, he and his assistant headmasters and security people swept through the school and anyone who was found in the corridors was suspended. The message circulated through the school. Teachers now had full classrooms for the first time.

It did not take long for a student to test him: a student was caught with something illegal in his possession. John was witness to this incident since he was on front door duty near the main office. Mr. Love called the police; when they arrived and asked Mr. Love to call the student to the office, Mr. Love gave them these instructions:

> I want you to go into the classroom, in front of his peers, and read him his rights . . . . I want you to put the handcuffs on him and I want you to take him out when I tell you to do it . . . just before the bell rings.

They did what he wanted them to do. The bell rang; and, as the students came out of their classes, the policemen and the student walked down the corridor. Another message circulated through the school. He had to reinforce this consequence, possibly, 2-3 times.

Mr. Love stood at the front door as students entered, and still does today--always vigilant. If a student entered and did not take off his hat, Mr. Love took it and it was returned at a cost of .25 at the end of the day. Students could not avoid him-- being tall, he saw them approaching. A quiet-spoken man, he did not have to raise his voice to demand their attention; carefully chosen words and a look communicated his messages. If he caught a student writing on a wall, he had him wash the entire wall, with a security person beside him while he did it. The graffiti board that he soon put up was a very effective way of channeling the habit.

The same students who were at the school misbehaving the year before were now behaving differently, whether they liked it or not. The change started with a strong headmaster; he brought discipline to the school. This was the beginning of improving the atmosphere of the school; once order and discipline were in place, then attention was turned to other issues.

Responding to Teacher Needs to Improve Morale

Mr. Love did have some problems with a few faculty members and department heads who, when he wanted to implement some of his policies, got into verbal arguments with him. That was resolved by having them transfer out of the school. "He was determined to 'run the ship'--and it worked," according to John; both staff and students needed someone to say, "This is the way we're going to do things."

Mr. Love was a firm believer in meetings--structured meetings. Each of his assistant headmasters was involved; each was in charge of an aspect of the school: curriculum, tardiness / discipline, bus transportation / lunch applications and, with a handout, kept people informed as to what was happening. Other issues and speakers, of course, were added. People could ask to be put on the agenda; advance notice of agenda topics was placed in teachers' mailboxes. The meetings always allowed for feedback from teachers; he gave ample time to the union and faculty senate. Every meeting was consistent--and still is.

Through his discipline in dealing with students, teachers began to see that they, finally, had someone who was going to back them

up. Teachers visibly saw how he responded to situations. For example, one day, John had a problem with a student in the library who began to use racial slurs against him. John reported the incident to Mr. Love and he immediately acted on it by the next period. He and John went to the classroom to find the student and settled the problem there, in front of the class. Mr. Love demanded respect toward teachers, and each other. Both teachers and students had to see how situations were handled.

Teachers knew that Mr. Love was approachable; he could always be stopped in the corridors and listened. If the problem needed immediate attention, he gave it--unless a teacher demanded or raised his or her voice. Teachers did not always get their way; but, if they were in the right, if they wanted to teach, he did everything to insure that that was going to happen. He did not tolerate people who did not do their job; he transferred them out of the school, very quietly.

Mr. Love had a great deal of respect for the faculty senate; he did not implement any policy that affected the entire faculty until he received their input. As an example, during the first year of his administration, John and other members of the BSSP group

approached him about surveying student attitudes toward school and the subjects that they were studying, as part of the group's intent to understand why students dropped out of school. Mr. Love would not approve the survey until he heard from the faculty senate. The faculty senate saw it negatively--that the survey might fall into the wrong hands and be used against them--that teachers were not doing their job. Mr. Love did not override the faculty senate, in this instance. The faculty senate has had a strong voice in the school; Mr. Love has always listened, but has not always accepted recommendations. But, he has always given reasons for his decisions.

Mr. Love has never told people that they <u>have to</u> do something--he has always <u>asked</u>. He asked certain people to take on tasks; he chose people to concentrate in an area in which they had expertise. Then, he let them go; he did not pressure them; he did not check up on them, because "he knows that they are going to do it," according to John. He has not stopped anyone who wanted to try something new; he encouraged people to take the initiative in starting new programs or activities. More has been accomplished on a one-to-one basis between or among individuals meeting at lunch or during common

free periods than at group meetings. Morale was higher, until the past few years when staff reductions began. There were parties--the Christmas party, the end of the year picnic; everybody was talking--and, not about work. John stated that morale was so high that "You could just 'taste it in the air'!" People have not wanted to socialize when they were depressed over staff reductions. John commented on staff reductions that have been occurring and its effect on the school:

> Losing 20-25 people destroys the school. It won't be the same school we've known for ten years . . . . It may go back to being what it was . . . and they'll blame the school . . . the faculty.

According to John, Mr. Love has been faced with a problem that has been beyond his control--"He can't provide people with job security, security in staying in this school." People have been here because they wanted to be here. Some have been here 20-30 years; they could have left long ago. Mr. Love has never stopped anyone who wanted to leave, and he has always fought to keep people who wanted to stay.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

There has been a great deal of support for students--something for everyone. There was not a reason for students not

finding an answer to a problem: there have been people to find employment for them if they wanted a job, or to support them in the college admissions process if that was what they wanted. The school has prepared students to better themselves, more than what was done 10 years ago. There have been many success stories of students who have gone on to college or have been gainfully employed and returned to tell us. There have been tutors; there have been all types of counseling services to help students resolve the issues that stand in the way of academic success. The school has had contact with all kinds of agencies through the SST.

Sometimes, students preferred personal conversations with staff members other than teachers and guidance counselors--so they talked to the librarian, added John; "I'm like a bartender--I'm there for a personal conversation, about anything." One-to-one personal interactions with students has been exemplified by Mr. Love with his easy-going and non-threatening manner. But, at the same time, according to John, "students know he has authority and expresses authority . . . but, he isn't authoritative--he's very efficient. When it's time to play, you play like hell, and when it's time to work, you work like hell." He has been approachable; but, "don't do anything

wrong because he'll step all over you and you deserve it--and he doesn't have to holler to do it," added John.

Just as there was a faculty senate for teachers, there was a student council to make students more aware of the democratic process of communicating. Mr. Love, consistently, has utilized the officers as spokespersons at meetings--not only at the school but at school committee and other meetings with outsiders. The student council has been an excellent means of teaching students how to communicate effectively. Many of the students have spoken before the mayor and the governor, sports personalities, media people, and have expressed themselves in a clear, concise manner to communicate their feelings. That has been part of their education--not the formal part. There have been activities and programs for every student; "it's important for kids to interact . . . to participate across grade levels . . . learning and using skills that they can't get in the classroom," John added.

Mr. Love has wanted the best for students; he has wanted to see them graduate. "He's given breaks to criminals to keep them in school--some of them are dead now. He gave them every break in the world," added John.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

Mr. Love began restoring the physical condition of the building in ways that he could--cleaning and painting and encouraging people to take pride in the daily upkeep of the school. But, the school had deteriorated to the point that the city had to be brought to court in order to make the $3 million of necessary repairs within and surrounding the school. It took several years to accomplish all repairs; the restoration highlighted the original beauty of the building that was built in the 1930's. An improvement in the surroundings made everyone feel better about being there.

After bringing order to the school, Mr. Love welcomed outsiders into the school. He was always proud of the school and the people, teachers and students, who wanted to be there. He established the collaborative to bring people together with selected members of the staff in consistently scheduled meetings in the library. He kept people organized and planning for the future: "Organization was the key to running the school . . . . He was well-organized . . . he knew what he was doing," John observed.

In 1984, the business partner helped in a way that the city could not or would not--rennovating the library for the school's 50th

birthday. As the librarian, John was consulted and gave direction to its re-design; the company selected the technicians and artists; company employees donated books to fill the shelves. The company has been donating furniture, equipment, and supplies that have always been needed. The company has provided many part-time and full-time jobs to students. Students have learned what proper attire is for the work force and that has made a difference in how students dress for school as well. The students have worked closely with company employees, many of whom have taken a special interest in them.

The university partner just seemed to have provided its facilities for the school's occasional use: the 50th birthday celebration, the yearly special education students' picnic, the gym, the library. Aside from the gifted and talented program, little has been done, educationally, for all students. Tutoring has benefited some students--and has benefited the university. There has not been a benefit for faculty to gain something from the university, i.e., courses at reduced cost or departmental influence in the school. "There appears to be very little that affects the daily life of the school," according to John.

Parents who have sent their children here believed that the school provided a safe environment and that their children were going to get a "decent" education, according to John. Their only reservation has been the location, a fear of the neighborhood and the gangs--which has been the most common reservation for White parents. Getting parents involved in their children's education, though, has been the hardest task. The school has tried everything to involve parents: different times of the day and week, feeding them, door prizes. The largest community activity has been the Thanksgiving dinner with the elderly.

Mr. Love had a vision, from the beginning, of the school being the computer magnet high school in the city. That was an excellent direction for the school. Teachers became interested in updating themselves through the after school computer classes. Teachers from other schools took part in the training sessions.

Unfortunately, the negative perception associated with the 1970's has carried over to today. There has been individual and team effort to change the school's image and the school has received recognition of its turn-around. The drug program that received national recognition, Mr. Love's many educator awards, the many

people from the media, government who have given favorable recognition to the school have not been able to erase the earlier image and the school's location. "The area will always be associated with the school in the public's perception," added John.

The past ten years have been filled with people who have been building and carrying out their ideas. The school was being built up: business equipment and computers in an office of the future, the library becoming a media center. Then, political decisions were made that destroyed everything instantly: the business department was completely eliminated, the librarian, department heads, and one of the two guidance counselors.

After 11 years as the librarian at the school, John's position was eliminated. That same year, he received his Ed. D. degree from the BSSP / University of Massachusetts, School of Education partnership. He was assigned to an elementary school as a Planning and Development Generalist, i.e., he rotates around the school to release teachers for their planning and development periods.
He is discouraged with the direction the school system is taking and the detrimental effect on the professionals in the schools who have been uprooted in the midst of reform initiatives.

Teacher Interview

Luke was proud of being a product of this city's public schools: he attended local grammar school, then was admitted to what is now known as an exam school (for students with recognized academic potential). With the transitional support of tutors provided by his father, Luke made the adjustment to the rigorous regime required by the school, graduating in the top 20/25% of his class. Steered away from the merchant marines by a persuasive father and realistic high school guidance counselor, Luke went on to a large, public state university where he majored in English--and, leaving room for options after graduation--a few education courses. His strengths in English led him to his introduction to teaching while still an undergraduate: teaching a mandatory English class to peers who were in jeopardy of failing (on Saturday mornings!) "Even then, I had people who didn't want to learn," Luke reflected. Beginning as a substitute teacher, he continued on to graduate chool to fulfill remaining certification requirements for a secondary English teaching certificate. After various jobs at city middle and high schools and after a temporary layoff, he began teaching at this school in 1982, with the incoming administration.

Identifying the Problems

When Luke received the call from the school department offering him a position as an English teacher at this school, he accepted it for several reasons: (1) he was recently married, (2) it would get him back into the high school area which is what he wanted, and (3) it was the only job available--he had been laid off at the end of the last school year, and this was the first offer of a job that was made. He took it, even though the school had a terrible reputation system-wide. Luke recalled that it was known as a

school in total chaos: they had had three headmasters in the last five years; there were boys [male students] there now; the community was the toughest place in the city; they stole teachers' cars out of the parking lot; teachers were assaulted; there were fights . . . . "In short, it was going to be hell," he concluded. After calling people who had anything to do with the school in recent years, he found that little was known of the new headmaster, except that he had been working at a nearby high school, which, before desegregation, had been traditionally all White, as assistant headmaster. Some people had strong feelings about the headmaster; therefore, his assistant was "tarred with the same brush," according to Luke. He then added, "It was assumed that since he was "one of the headmaster's people, he was not a "real educator;" he was from a Department of Youth Services background.

As with many teachers who were new to a building, Luke was given very little choice in the classes that he was going to teach. He was given, therefore, the 9th and 10th grade English classes.

Responding to Teacher Needs to Improve Morale

Luke was aware of one evident difference between middle school and this high school staff: although the latter group, on the

whole, was friendly, they maintained professional relationships among themselves. They did not socialize after school the way middle school teachers did. In fact, there would be many teachers whom he did not get to know on a first name basis for several years. Luke was aware of the presence of the new headmaster; he was always in the corridors. In addition to moving the students on to class, he stopped to speak with teachers. He soon found out about Luke's recent graduate work in theater arts and immediately asked, "What would you like to do? Would you like to put on shows?" That first year, Luke became instrumental in organizing student assemblies, a talent show, an' awards ceremony. Halfway through the year, the headmaster approached him and said that he was having a problem and asked if he could help him out by organizing the senior prom. Although he had never done it before, he took on that responsibility, which, as Luke made an insightful comment, was

> . . . an example of the headmaster having the foresight or ability to give someone the opportunity to have someone prove themselves without any solid background or experience to prove it by.

Recognizing his interest--and strength--in the theater, he was then asked to teach a new drama class. He welcomed the opportunity

to get away from, as he described it, the "tedium of teaching the same 9th and 10th grade English classes over and over . . . . having the drama class once a day kept my spirits up knowing I was teaching at least one class that I really enjoyed."

Luke's involvement with seniors led him to be asked to be one of the teachers of a new class for college-bound students, an initiative of the guidance counselor: the college/career prep class to monitor seniors through the college application process. With the revival of the yearbook tradition and the school newspaper, Luke found that students were unable to spend the needed time after school on the tasks, due to other commitments: many of the students were in after school enrichment programs at the university; others worked at the business partner site or at jobs provided by the Private Industry Council (PIC) in part-time and full-time jobs; others had home commitments with younger siblings or children of their own. When he suggested a journalism class, which gave students the practical experience of putting together a yearbook and school newspaper, the headmaster immediately sanctioned it. A few years later, with the expansion of the school's computer magnet theme, Luke offered to teach a desk-top publishing

class for which he had just completed training. In recounting the progression of his job in the school, Luke highlighted the uniqueness of this headmaster and his administration:

> From the beginning, they seemed very accomodating. They were happy to have staff people who were willing to make a 'stretch', in addition to teaching . . . to provide enrichment to the curriculum. I can't say that I had that experience with an administrator prior to this in the city's public schools. Basically, I felt I was hired to teach English and that was it! Everything else was secondary . . . frivolous, frivolous!

Luke was provided with the opportunity to do the things in which he had expertise and which he wanted to do, whether it was within or outside the classroom, working alone or with others. Just as he sensed an appreciation by the headmaster, others sensed that appreciation also. The headmaster provided a safe environment, whether during the school day or after school hours. The number of people willing to "stretch" themselves and "provide a little more" has increased over the years, according to Luke. People have stayed after school in recent years because of the safety factor, rather than leaving at 1:45 as they did ten years ago. There have been people here, according to Luke, "doing terrific things; the opportunity was provided and the people who 'stretch' themselves do so by choice." There was an awareness that some people were working harder than

others for the same pay, but it did not divide the faculty; "everyone has carved out their [sic] own niche. They're a pretty harmonious group of people-- professionally--not socially so much. I guess that's the best you could ask for," Luke concluded.

Luke admitted to often being at the school until 4:00 p.m. working on the yearbook and has been constantly amazed at the number of his colleagues who were also still there on behalf of the youngsters. One of the school's failures or stumbling blocks that came out of the accreditation review a few years ago was--"[lack of] communication in-house and [lack of] public relations out-house." Luke explained it this way:

> It's just that we're too busy to get around to this! And some people don't think it's important that other people know what they're doing. They just do it; they're not looking for any pat on the back or an article in the newspaper or money. They do it because that's how they are. Not everyone who is getting paid as a teacher is just a teacher; there are many more things involved in being a teacher.

As Luke reminisced and pondered the future, he added that he has been concerned for the headmaster's health; this may be his last year as headmaster for that reason. In that case, although Luke has been comfortable in this school, he, too, would explore his options, possibly transferring. Luke never said "No" to the headmaster, or

anyone else who needed help; but, he felt that he could not keep up this pace. He recalled signing up to be a teacher 21 years ago and "they've" [society] changed that job description in the middle of his career; the expectation for teachers to be social workers has not been a fair expectation, he concluded. He expressed concern over the lack of young, new teachers coming into the schools who can better keep up with the energy level of the youngsters; he did not want to die in the Boston public schools. He concluded that it may soon be time to move on to a less stressful locale, but still in education.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

Through his enrichment classes, Luke felt that he was better able to encourage students to take more responsibility for their actions, their successes and their failures. When they tried to put the responsibility of producing the newspaper or the yearbook on him, he had to constantly remind them that he was only the advisor; he encouraged them to consult with each other--the editor, the layout person, etc., those who have taken the responsibility for the different tasks of organizing the articles that the reporters have written and would like to see in print. The issue of taking responsibility was more an adolescent issue than anything else.

Luke gradually assumed all the responsibilities of senior class advisor, reviving many of the activities that had been dissolved as a result of the prior turbulent years: working with class officers, collecting class dues, fund-raising, restarting the yearbook tradition, organizing the prom and graduation--everything traditionally related to what it has meant to be a senior.

As a result of meetings between the administration and English and math departments regarding the abysmally low Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and the relatively few students who had taken the test, Luke was asked to teach a new SAT review class in English with a member of the math department teaching the math component. Although the test score average has not gone up significantly, greater numbers of students have become interested in going to college and have taken both the PSAT and SAT. Everyone has been encouraged to take the tests. Many students have been opting for some kind of structured setting after graduation.

There were many success stories: 50% of the school's graduates, and sometimes more, have gone on to higher education: from community colleges to career programs, to prestigious colleges and universities around the country. Some graduates joined the

armed services; others spent a year in the city's urban peace corps doing community service.

Many outside agencies were brought into the school by Mr. Love to help students: the doctor who has come in every week as a member of the SST; the agency that has serviced pregnant teenagers by putting them in contact with the proper resources outside the school; and the drug and alcohol agency who provides counseling. Two educational agencies have been in the school two days a week providing college and financial aid counseling. Some of the counselors have been better than others in terms of their skills and knowledge. One of the programs, which is city-wide, was initiated by the CEO of the school's business partner and has provided "the last dollar" (what the student has to pay after financial aid is determined) needed by students to meet college costs. In practice, very few of the students seemed to receive this money; the program contended that the students did not follow through with the process during the summer after graduation. The program needed improvement--to better support students to the end of the process.

A wonderful addition to the school, as of two years ago, was a bilingual program for Cape Verdean students. "It's one of the best

things that has happened to us [the school] . . . ," according to Luke. By example, they have influenced their peers and the overall atmosphere of the school: respectful and well-mannered, good students, for the most part, who come to school prepared, wanting to learn, wanting to use education to improve their lives by going to college.

While in school, many of our students have been provided with the opportunities to extend themselves beyond the school into the community through the initiatives of the headmaster and staff members. One special education teacher, who has trained students through an on-hands restaurant experience on the school site, has taken the same students out to service community and school system functions. Many of these students have gone on to work in very responsible jobs in leading hotels and restaurants. Another teacher has taken groups of students one day a week to local elementary schools where they have tutored and served as Big Brothers. This activity has encouraged several students to comment that they have found that they have enjoyed working with young children and have been considering becoming teachers. Another teacher, who was active in the community and knew all the gangs and their

affiliations, also knew who needed to be kept apart from whom in the school. The coaches have done "yeoman duty" with many our students because of their lack of discipline; they have tried to encourage self-confidence and self-discipline on the athletic field, which has required a great deal of stamina. Another teacher tutored anybody who wanted it, for free, after school hours. Although this teacher was renumerated for his work with the Massachusetts PreEngineering Enrichment Program (MASSPEP), at other times there were students whom he was just helping with their math. A safe environment has enabled many people to do the little bit extra that they have wanted to do.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

Luke was pleased to see a functioning business partner when he came to this school; there was a contact person assigned to the school who showed up on a regular basis to coordinate services between the business partner and the school for both students and teachers. The major service that the business partner provided for students was jobs. Although some graduates have gone on to full-time jobs with the company after graduation, the focus has been on providing part-time after school jobs and full-time summer jobs. In

recent years, however, the number of jobs has been decreasing rather than increasing and the amount of funding for partnership activities has also been decreasing. The trend has resulted in feelings of disappointment rather than dissatisfaction with the partnership concept.

Some of the services extended to the school and its members have been: subsidized tickets to a theater company, computer classes and productivity enrichment seminars for teachers given by business personnel at the business site, and professional advice on recruitment strategies. The consultants from the partner company met with the staff committee to assist in creating a video and printed material about the school for recruitment purposes, which the school has been using for several years. Unfortunately, an on-going working relationship between company staff and school staff, using this task as an example, appeared to be lacking. The lack of a return visit to evaluate and improve on what was done illustrated a "lack of understanding of continuity--of how things happen in a school; they just assume it's the same old thing over and over--and it certainly isn't," according to Luke. The company has published an article every once in a while in its company newsletter, highlighting

an event that brought the two partners together; but, with its resources, it could be doing more to champion the cause of the school through the city-wide media by emphasizing the positive happenings at the school.

Every year for the past ten years, since Luke has been the senior class advisor, he and the class officers have been invited by the CEO of the company for lunch in his private office. Luke concluded that, although the CEO has been apparently very strongly committed to the city schools and education, there has been a problem somewhere between the CEO and the company representative; there has been somebody saying "Hold the reins on the budget!" The appropriations that once supported the printing of the school newspaper and the mailing list, which served as positive publicity for the school, have been cut out completely. Financial support for other school activities has been greatly reduced. In reality, business partnership involvement has not affected the teacher at the classroom level. Luke summarized the school's relationship with both the university and business partners:

> The successes have been individual successes--the director of a specific program at the university and the CEO of the business partner; failures have been institutional failures.

> Should these two individuals leave, I don't think there'd be much of anything without them.

One program that has provided a special service to the school, benefiting not only students, but teachers and the school as a whole, has been the program for gifted and talented students at the university partner site. Without that program, the school would not have an enrichment service for the best students. The students who have been in the program have enrolled in some of the most prestigious colleges and universities in the country. The school did have a limited honors program in English, math, and history in some grade levels for a few years in the early 1980's, but, with budget cuts, the classes had to be eliminated because there were so few students in them.

Luke described the program director as "an amazing individual who could probably be making a fortune for herself in the private sector because of her intellect . . . fully capable as an administrator, but she's chosen to do this, for some reason, for our benefit." One of the weak links in the partnership has been the lack of a university on site representative to whom the school could communicate needs and who, in turn, could translate school needs back to the university. The program director, unofficially, has provided that service.

What we have not seen has been the university actively trying to involve the school in its work--and there is great potential for that--if better communication could be fostered between the two institutions. An effort has been made, through a proposal for a grant written by the program director, to bring university people and school people together "for the common good and enhancement of the curriculum," as described by Luke. As the school liaison, Luke acknowledged the wonderful concept but, he added, in reality "bringing those two groups of people together is tough!" The misconceptions on both sides have been difficult to dispel, i.e., what constituted being a university professor and what constituted being a teacher. As a member of the committee dispersing funds to teachers, based on their application-writing for this mini-grant, Luke heard the complaints from both sides: the backlash of rejection from the teacher who was not chosen to be funded and the professors' criticism of teachers who did not measure up to the formalities: i.e., typing, meeting deadlines, protocol of the teacher-initiated contact with the professor, etc.. Luke concluded that " . . . it's been a long time since many professors have been in a high school and, . . . teachers don't have any idea of what a professor

does." In the early 1980's, the school made a conscious, outreach effort to the university by inviting representatives of many departments to the school to attend a social to meet the faculty and the new administration. They appeared to be very impressed with the school, and the faculty felt that it had made some personal contacts. Unfortunately, there was not a plan put in place to maintain interaction.

The university has made its facilities available to the school on many occasions: it hosted the school's 50th birthday celebration to accomodate the thousands of alumni; the athletic facilities have been used by the sports teams on numerous occasions to host visiting teams; the library has been used for field trips by the school librarian. The AGP, now in its second year, and, again, funded through the grant received by the university program director, has brought university graduate students into the school to serve as tutors to 9th grade students in efforts to motivate students to pursue post-secondary education. Luke summarized the partnership:

> If you eliminate the talented and gifted program and the director, you eliminate the entire concept of a university partner for us. It is her initiative that involves the university with the school.

Luke described his early attempts at calling parents: "If I call home, I don't talk to parents; they're not home . . . they're working. The message never gets through; they never call back." Finding the attempts frustrating, Luke learned to deal with the problems himself. "A lack of parental involvement has been, probably, the major problem at the school," according to Luke. Parents have been in a daily struggle to survive--working, going to clinics, chasing social workers, coping with living in a dangerous, unsettled community. They have been interested in their children's education, but, "being able to influence their children--they don't see that . . . ," Luke concluded; they have sent their children to us, hoping that we will, somehow, do all that they cannot do." At the last meeting, Luke saw 12 parents-- more parents than he saw 5 years ago.

A great deal of the school's negative perception has stemmed from the school's location in the worst possible place for a school--in the middle of gang territory. The most notorious streets for drug-dealers and gangs surrounded the school. The school has received its share of negative publicity; but, gradually, the media began reporting the positive things that were happening. The school made an effort to contact politicians, school-committee people,

newspaper and television reporters to attend school functions, such as the annual Thanksgiving dinner for senior citizens. One major newspaper columnist has been a regular advisor to the journalism class. Now, with an awareness of the people and the everyday happenings, the school has often been featured in his columns. "Bringing outsiders into the school, to see that it's not as bad as you might expect or suspect--that's only going to help us . . . any kind of positive publicity," Luke concluded. The school newspaper was an early attempt to publicize the talents of the students and their activities. Unfortunately, its distribution has been limited with the cutback of the business partner's financial support of mailing and printing costs. With its resources, the company could be doing more to champion the cause of the school.

The sports teams have been bringing positive attention to the school. People have been getting to know the school, not because of the school's computers or the library, but because of the football and basketball teams. The publicizing of changes in the school has resulted in the school department being proud of the school. According to Luke, when the CEO of a major discount chain wanted to set up a program, similar to one in another state, "to improve the

self-image, self-concept" of students by providing free clothing to seniors as part of "Dress For Success Days" at the school, school department officials immediately thought of Mr. Love. As the senior advisor, Luke was involved and added, amusingly,

> It's something where we learn about the youngsters. The boys don't know how to tie ties . . . and when they come in that first day and need someone to tie their ties . . . it really humanizes the whole situation. It brings you back to earth, somewhat, to see them struggling to tie their ties for the first time!

Unfortunately, the school is always going to be tainted by its location. Luke added,

> In many ways, the school is between a 'rock and a hard place' in improving public perception--there's only so much you can do. The school has changed due to joint effort--Mr. Love with his laissez-faire, kid-oriented style . . . he believes in all kids, he believes they all have something to offer and he's able to convey that message . . . . and most of the faculty share that perception that he has for the kids at the school. That gets out . . . it takes a while . . . a lot of hard work. It's a slow process and it gets more difficult as you get older--and we're all getting older.

Mr. Love has become discouraged with attempts to recruit White students to the school because he knew that, no matter how much computer equipment the school had, people who lived in a traditionally White area of the city were not going to send their children to this area for their high school experience.

Parent Interview

Mrs. Jones is the parent of two children who graduated from the school. She was born and raised in a large, urban city, north of Boston where she attended elementary school to the 3rd grade, then moved to Washington D.C. where she completed her high school education. She liked school so much that she often went to summer school for enrichment. She did not experience the segregated school system that her older sister did; she could choose the school that she wanted to attend. She was thankful that she and her children have had that choice. When she moved to Boston, she took an active interest in her children's schools. She became a lunch monitor and, eventually, a paraprofessional and has continued working in that capacity to the present.

Identifying the Problems

Mrs. Jones' son was a student at the school during the turbulent, one year tenure of the third headmaster in two years. She had chosen the school for her son to attend because, although it had a terrible reputation, it was still her neighborhood school. She did not want her son being on a bus for an hour or more every day in order to get to school. She was aware of the negative happenings in the school: the knives, the fights, the fire alarms, and the police being called constantly. She felt better knowing that if something did happen that involved her son, she was close by and could arrive at the school quickly; if teachers had to call because there was a problem, she could be there. She had always been involved in her children's previous schools, and wanted to continue to show her

support as a parent. Mrs. Jones was at the school several times that year. She attended the open house meetings and visited, on her initiative, to see how her son was doing. She found out, by being there, that her son was one of the many students who were always in the corridors. According to Mrs. Jones, he "never got in any trouble," but, he was not doing his work in class and he was passing; "Yes," she added, "I went up there and I fussed about it!" But no one could change what was happening in the school. She met with teachers a few times, but did not get to know them very well. She continued:

> It wasn't a very comfortable atmosphere being at the school. It seemed that there were always police in the corridors. I don't know if the attitude of teachers was that they were more [like] baby-sitters than teachers because of the situation of what was going on there--there were fire alarms 3-4 times a week or they would have police up there all the time.

Beginning the Change

The following year was when Mr. Love arrived with his two assistant headmasters. Mrs. Jones never heard of them, but she was glad that the school had another principal:

> I felt that a Black principal in a Black neighborhood would better relate with the children and it turned out to be true. They've done a complete turn-around at the school.

Mrs. Jones felt that Mr. Love could better deal with Black children because he had been a probation officer for children with the juvenile court and knew how to relate to them. He did prevent students from roaming the corridors and they were in classes; they listened to him.

The school looked better: it was cleaner; there was not trash on the floor anymore; and, students did not write on the walls. Mrs. Jones recalled being with the headmaster the day that he picked out the colors for the interior painting of the school. The new lighting was installed; windows and outside doors were replaced; the outside patio was repaved.

Many of the teachers left the school at the end of the previous, turbulent year, and when the staff changed the next year with the new administration, Mrs. Jones became better acquainted with them. She became involved in many of the school activities through the parent council when she became its president. She worked with the teacher liaison and several teachers and parents in attempts to encourage more parents to become involved with the school.

The staff, both teachers and support staff, became more "stable and stronger" with the new administration, according to Mrs.

Jones. The students were out of the corridors and into the classrooms where they belonged because of the headmaster. Teachers were able to teach again, which made them happy. The atmosphere of the school made the staff more relaxed--they did not have to worry about their safety anymore. Their attitudes changed--they became more involved with the students.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

From the moment that she met Mr. Love and his assistants, Mrs. Jones liked them because, she stated, "they seemed like they cared." She felt that Mr. Love could deal with the problems. After he did deal with them--by telling the students to leave their weapons and marijuana at home, to get out of the corridors and into the classrooms, that they were there to learn and prepare for their futures--the students knew that he cared about them and wanted the best for them. The students took better care of the school and were nicer to each other and teachers.

As president of the parent council, she felt that the school could do more for the students, so she was instrumental in beginning a scholarship fund that benefited deserving students who did not receive other scholarships, but still needed money to meet college

expenses. A scholarship dinner became a tradition for a few years, raising $900.00-$1,000+. Everyone--staff, administration, students, and parents--was involved in preparing for the Saturday event. She and others went out to community businesses to solicit food donations, contacted the media for publicity, prepared and served the meal.

There were many more activities in the school for students once Mr. Love became headmaster. Mrs. Jones' son was on the football team; her daughter was on the softball team. In her senior year, her daughter became very involved with senior class activities and was elected class treasurer. When she graduated, she was awarded a scholarship from the parent council and one scholarship from an organization of Black professionals and was accepted to several colleges. She chose a local, state university "on the headmasters advice," according to Mrs. Jones.

The people at the school have been very supportive of children, and children have been "coming out as . . . better person[s]." The school gave them the opportunity to go to college and as a parent, she added, "I am comfortable with the advice that the children are getting." The students have not received bad advice from the

headmaster or the guidance counselor. They have tried to put students in the right direction so that when they graduated, they could do something positive--go to college or get a job.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

Mrs. Jones' first task as president of the parent council was to send letters to parents in an effort to recruit more members. It was difficult; only a few parents responded. Meetings were scheduled at different times of the day and night, as well as different days of the week, in order to see what day and time drew the largest number of parents. Refreshments were always served--a brunch or dinner; there were raffles, gift certificates, door prizes (a microwave, for example)--even if only one parent came. More parents, students, and staff became involved in the effort to raise scholarship money than other activities. Outreach efforts were never rewarding. There were many reasons for lack of parental involvement, according to Mrs. Jones: people did not want to come out at night; many parents were disgusted with their children and their school problems; many of the single parents were not much older than their children and had problems of their own; many parents did not want to take the time to become involved; they were not motivated. She added, "It should

not be up to teachers to have to raise somebody else's child, especially when they [teachers] have 20-25 students in a classroom." Although she was a single parent, the difference was that she "was motivated to become involved in her children's education," she stated.

As president, she and a few other parents lobbied--letter-writing, going to district and school system meetings--regarding school system issues that affected the school. There were rumored threats of the school being closed; there was a school system movement to change the school from a district to a city-wide school. She went to the community superintendent on behalf of the headmaster and was assured that the school would not close and would not lose teachers. "This is one of the few Black schools; there's only this school and one other," she added. If the school became a city-wide school, students living in the district would be pushed out. She was an advocate of the school becoming the computer magnet because district youngsters would not be pushed out, but others could enroll in the school, by choice. "This is what the headmaster wanted, and that's what we wanted as parents," concluded Mrs. Jones.

Mrs. Jones saw the headmaster's outreach to the community as he tried to get different people to become involved with the school--for example, agencies to help the children if they needed help. The school supported the new fast-service restaurant that was opened in the area. It was good for the community and it was good for the school; it created possible jobs for students. The school has been open more to the community; there have been evening classes in typing and computers.

The business partner has done a tremendous job in helping the school: the library renovations, the Office of the Future, and the jobs it has given students. Both her children had part-time and full-time jobs, after school and during the summer, which continued even after her daughter entered college. She was always updated with changes in computer technology. Now that her daughter has a child, the income is very much needed.

Although she has not been deeply involved with the school since her daughter graduated, she has kept in contact with the headmaster. She has remained a parent spokesperson in communications with school system officials on issues such as budget cuts. She remained a community advocate for the school,

especially in changing lingering, negative perceptions. In her position as paraprofessional in a nearby middle school, she has often influenced prospective high school students. She felt that parents did not take the time to read the book, published by the school system, that described the schools and their offerings. Therefore, a great deal of personal interaction has been needed between those who did know about the school's assets and those who did not know.

It is unfortunate that the media has contributed to the negative perception when they reported negative happenings in the community and then mentioned the school in the same sentence. The occasional positive publicity, such as the coverage of the Thanksgiving dinner for senior citizens, has not been sufficient. On-going, positive publicity has been necessary; the school newspaper was an excellent means.

She, her children, and grandaughter have been proud to join the school in activities such as the 2-3 Saturday "Beautification Days," to clean the school's surroundings and to plant shrubs and grass. The school is part of the community and many of its residents have taken greater pride in the school's accomplishments.

University Representative Interview

Charity has been the program director of the gifted and talented program for students at the university partner site. She was from a family of educators and "became a demanding consumer of education." Her early education was at a private school where her father was headmaster. She went on to graduate from a large, prestigious, woman's college in Massachusetts. At a conference, while working for the Educational Opportunities Program, she met the vice-chancellor of a large, public university in Boston, who shared with her his ideas for an enrichment program for talented, minority, urban students and asked her to turn the idea into reality. After a year of planning, the program was ready to be shared with the partner high schools of the university.

Identifying the Problems

When Charity began her involvement with the school, it was the first year of the new administration with Mr. Love as the headmaster. He--and the school--still had to deal with the effects of the unrest and upheaval of the previous years. There were issues to be resolved: morale of people, concerns for safety, whether the headmaster was approachable. There was a sense of lack of pride within people and toward the school, a lack of a sense of community. Charity concluded, "If teachers don't have a sense of pride, high morale, a sense of community, how could students . . .?"

The idea that began with the vice-chancellor of the university partner, then involving Charity as the program director, progressed to the planning and development stages. The idea was to develop a

program that was geared to working with with the bright, talented students who were achieving in the partner schools. These students were functioning in school curricula that were geared toward the basic skills of the majority of students. Students with potential were already being serviced by the Upward Bound program. The need was established: in general, the high level students were not being served in urban schools.

When the university representatives took the ideas to the school, they found that the school "did not welcome us with open arms," recalled Charity. The people in the school were skeptical, which, Charity later found out, grew out of previous involvement with the university (Teacher Corps). They questioned, "Is this going to be another program that the university is going to be running . . . [which] will be here today and gone tomorrow?" They were not interested in investing time and energy in supporting a program that would be gone in a few years when the money was gone. Although the reaction from school people was unexpected, it was understood. What Charity found more disturbing was that . . .

> we ran into a great deal of resistance--not from all personnel, but, from a number of school personnel who did not believe that there were <u>any</u> talented kids in the school. If there were

> teachers and administrators who didn't believe that the kids were talented, then, that message was getting communicated . . . so the kids don't see themselves as being talented.

Many school people assumed that there really was not a need for this program for the gifted and talented students. Many felt that the talented students were going to be successful anyway. From her experience, Charity knew that that was not true. The first part of the mission of their program was clear: "We wanted to serve talented kids--to provide an academic experience that would provide them [students] for higher education and tap into their potential." The second part of the mission evolved later, according to Charity: ". . . to use the program as a vehicle to talk about excellence and to raise the standards within the school."

Beginning the Change

Mr. Love knew that there were many problems at the school, and he felt strongly that one way to create an excellent school was to welcome outsiders--with quality control. He said,

> We welcome you to our school, but we have to be assured that it is in the best interests of the students . . . as long as we are 'in sync' [synchronized] in terms of our goals . . . .

With the reassurance that the university gave him, Mr. Love supported the initiative. The university program had the support

from the administration but it was a long struggle to win the support of the faculty. The program began in the spring with the recruitment of 5 students from the school, and 5 more from each of the two other partner schools, to take part in the summer program.

Responding to Teacher Needs to Improve Morale

Charity returned to the school in the fall to share the results of the summer program and to recruit more students in the expansion of the program to an after school enrichment experience at the university site. Realizing the importance of making personal contact with staff members, she met with small groups of teachers in their department meetings to give the presentation and to answer questions. Initially, there was a difference of opinion as to the type of student that the program would service. The school, in one instance, was supportive of a student whom teachers felt had potential but was not performing. They felt that the program would motivate him; but, when he continued to do poorly in the home school, the school wanted to take him out of the program. This was not an acceptable policy for the program director. The tension that resulted led Charity to establish a process in dealing with differing viewpoints. We go back to the school and discuss it, asking, 'What

suggestions do you have? . . . getting their input and feedback . . . . Let's see if there's better way to do it." This incident led to guidelines being drawn up that students had to maintain "satisfactory academic progress in regular school." She communicated to staff that she wanted their input, but,

> the final decision [as to who would be in the program] has to rest with us [the program] because we are responsible for the program and the integrity of it.

Working with staff members was a learning process. At times, teachers' well-intentioned counseling efforts conflicted with the advice of the program people, causing some teachers to feel that their efforts were not appreciated. Charity admitted to understanding the behavior of school staff better now than originally:

> It's [teaching is] a tough job! We're a lot more sensitive to the difficulties that teachers have to deal with--the myriad of social problems that teachers have to deal with in the classroom. We can be a lot more diplomatic in trying to resolve problems while they are little problems.

The goal of strengthening communication between school staff and the university program has been an on-going effort, on the part of Charity. She often found out about problems in a round-about way. For example, on a day when there was an information session for

students regarding the program, there were not any students from one teacher's class in attendance. Charity later found out that the teacher had a problem with students in the program coming back to her classroom "with an air of superiority," as she recalled the teacher's description. Her way of dealing with the problem was not to allow <u>any</u> students to attend the information session. Charity asked for a meeting with the cluster teachers to say that the manifested behavior of students was not acceptable and to talk about how to deal with the problem. "Getting teachers to bring problems to your [my] attention hasn't always been easy," Charity concluded.

Charity has seen the effect of outside pressures on staff from the school system--when the school system cannot, from her viewpoint, "make a commitment . . . to put political and resources to bear on the situation . . . to provide stability." For the ten years that she has been associated with the school, she has seen the demoralizing effect in the school. She understood how teachers did not feel valued--when they were not given the tools of books and materials with which to teach, when there was not a provision for professional development to deal with the difficult issues

associated with the population that they served. Amidst the talk of restructuring schools by those working in the individual schools, the school system has talked of massive lay-offs and movement of personnel.

Through a multi-faceted proposal for a grant that was funded, the university supported school improvement by providing resources that "enhance the capacity of the school to develop the talent and potential of all kids," according to Charity. In preparation for writing the proposal, Charity began by asking school personnel for their input as to what was important to them. As a result, one part of the grant provided support for teachers to work cooperatively with other teachers and was also a means to obtain more curriculum materials. The intent was to work at the classroom level with the individual teachers. The grant required that: (1) the teacher worked cooperatively with a university faculty member as a consultant; (2) the activity related to the classroom curriculum; and (3) the teacher wrote up what they did, and was encouraged to share the results with other teachers. Many teachers have applied for the grants. After some initial tensions being overcome, i.e., criticism of the quality of some proposals, many teachers have received the grants.

Many teachers have expressed to Charity that the way that they have been teaching for 20-25 years is not working--that they know that they need to teach differently. Many of the students are not achieving at the level that they should be. There have been so few resources to get the training that they admit is needed; it is frustrating for them when when everyone wants them to make changes, but no one has provided the tools to make changes. In that respect, morale of teachers is not any better.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

As chairperson of the achievement and attendance subcommittee of the SIC, Charity has been supporting the school in developing motivational strategies. Some of the financial resources have come from the business partner (in the early days) and from a small, state grant. The attendance club has been an on-going means of rewarding students who have had perfect attendance for a marking term by taking them on field trips or giving them gifts or gift certificates. Incentive rewards have been given to students who have earned honor role grades or who have been nominated by teachers for excellence in subject areas. The feedback from students has been very positive and,

> we're starting to see some real impact with the activities. It creates a sense of school spirit, a sense of community, that is so important with kids.

The second part of the funded grant provided money to work around more avenues for improving attendance and achievement. An outcome of the earlier meeting with school personnel, an identified need to better support 9th grade students resulted in a new class: a guidance class. The grant funded a teacher for three years (now in its second year). The teacher worked closely with the academic teachers in the 9th grade cluster, concentrating on identified skills that they felt helped students to be successful academically and in life-planning: goal-setting, time-management, communication, career awareness, and issues, such as violence prevention. One of the two days of the class was activity-based: the students wrote in a journal. The teacher read the journals; then, the second day, the students got feedback about what they had written. Charity and the teachers have talked regularly with the students about the direction of the class and its usefulness. The teacher used the class to reinforce activities that were going on in their subject classes. "It's a nice way [that] they can all work together with the kids," Charity added.

Two years ago, Charity arranged a meeting of the new chancellor of the university with the headmasters of the partner schools to discuss their issues of concern. Mr. Love expressed his concern of the small number of the school's graduates that were being accepted by the university and his frustrations in dealing with the admisssions office. His feeling was--"You're our partner and we can't even get our kids into your school." Charity returned to her office to discuss the matter with her boss and they came up with an idea for the AGP. The chancellor expressed support and asked the headmasters or liaisons to work with university staff in developing the guidelines. The guidance counselor, as the school liaison, took part in the meetings, describing school course offerings and coming to an agreement with the university as to which courses met admissions requirements.

In the fall, 9th grade students were told that if they maintained a "C" or better average, they were guaranteed admission to the university and the university would work at providing them with adequate financial aid. The program was developed around the assumption that: the small group of high performing students would be serviced by the gifted and talented program; a comparable small

group of students would be in danger of failing; the vast majority in the middle would be candidates for the AGP. A tutoring component was built into the program to support students who did not meet the required grade point average.

The first obstacle evidenced itself after the first year: an analysis of 9th grade report cards showed that the middle group of students was very small. The tutorial component was strengthened to support students in bringing up their grades. Private sector money was raised to expand the number of tutors who could come to the school site to work regularly with students. In analyzing last year's group, now sophomores, it was found that students who took part in the tutoring have been doing much better this year; they were in good standing in the program. The problem has been--getting the kids to participate in the tutoring! Simply saying that the university is going to guarantee them admission, four years down-the-line, was not sufficient incentive. More money was raised to strengthen the parent component: hiring a part-time outreach worker who was responsible for calling each of the parents of the students in the program on a regular basis, and, the parents of those students who were required to participate in tutoring because they did not meet

the required 2.0 standard at least once a week. "But, it's a struggle . . . a real struggle. . . getting the parents to support the need for kids to take advantage of this tutoring," she added. Charity has been trying to raise money in order to offer stipends to students, as they have done in the other university programs.

In the early days, the pool of students for the gifted and talented program was the weakest of the three schools. Today it is the strongest. She added,

> It's a 'dog fight' to get in!" The school has created an expectation that kids wanted to work towards, . . . that didn't exist in the early days. Kids make a conscious decision that they want to be in the program and make an effort toward it.

Now the challenge is, with the AGP and its components, to help the larger group of students make that conscious decision to be in the program.

Charity cited the need for teachers to focus on becoming an excellent academic institution by focusing on curricula issues to raise the level of performance of <u>all</u> students. According to Charity:

> The headmaster is committed to serving students who might not make it--the at-risk kids. In that context, it's a challenge to create an academic learning environment and course offerings in which a high-risk kid can function . . . with the kids who are prepared to work in a more challenging environment.

Charity has been told by teachers that they feel that students have a greater interest in education today and are more motivated. She agrees, in part, but she added, "possibly the expectations of the teachers has also changed."

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

The first year of Mr. Love's administration was characterized by many outside agencies being brought into the school. The need was established: everyone had to be brought together in the same room, occasionally, to clarify what each was doing and to encourage them to better collaborate among themselves. Thus began the school collaborative as the structure to bring to fruition the idea of how to better use these outside agencies to work better for the school.

The agency and staff representatives, a group of 25, met monthly in the school library. The early problem of such a large group being so hard to manage, therefore, not being able to do any "real work," was solved by dividing the group into small committees. The first few meetings were spent brainstorming, identifying the major needs of the school, then, coming up with 4-5 broad themes and creating subcommittees to address those broad areas. The areas have stayed very much the same: attendance and achievement

(chaired by Charity), parent outreach, recruiting / marketing, higher education / career awareness.

The collaborative process shifted from being a means of updating each other in the work that each was doing, to being a dialogue with the school "identifying school needs and bringing resources and initiatives to bear on the needs to try to improve whatever needs to be improved," according to Charity. The number of agencies who participated in the council dwindled, primarily due to budget cuts at the agency level. Some were not in existence any longer; others came into the school, provided their service, then returned to the agency or left for another school. Some were members of the SST and attended that meeting. The collaborative, initiated by the headmaster, later became the state-mandated SIC.

The talented and gifted program at the university has been a vehicle to enhance public perception of the school. The director and her co-workers, when speaking to the media or university faculty, or any outsider, have referred to the students as "alumns" of the program and the school, tieing the two together. "We try to say, 'Our success is your success,'" added Charity. The students have become excellent spokespersons when interviewed--as they talked about the

positive presence of the university in the school. With the recent expansion of the program into the local middle schools, students were encouraged to enroll in the partner high schools with the added incentive of automatically being admitted into the high school component of the program. When middle school students--and parents--have said that they were not considering this high school for safety reasons, Charity involved the high school students to answer their questions. Pros and cons were presented to the prospective students; but, she and students pointed out, "In particular, at this school, you couldn't get a more supportive administrator who 'bends over backwards' to make students feel comfortable and tries to meet the needs of kids."

The people at the school have been very accomodating in individualizing students' courses of study; with flexible scheduling, if a student needed to double up on math courses, both the headmaster and the guidance counselor have said, "How can we arrange the student's schedule so that it is in the best interest of the student."

Students have been given needed support, from the school and the program, to make the high school experience a rigorous one.

Students may get a more rigorous curriculum in the exam schools, but they have not received the support.

The parents of the students in the program "tend to be a very satisfied group;" therefore, except for the celebration events, the program's parent meetings were not well-attended, according to Charity. The director supported the school by trying to get the parents to become more involved in the school and to support its efforts better. "Parental involvement--That's a hard one!" Charity concluded. People were busy, struggling to put bread on the table, some working several jobs--they did not have time left over at the end of a day.

A co-worker in the program has been a member of the parent outreach subcommittee of the SIC, still working at ways to draw parents into the school. As part of the AGP, four parent workshops were built into the structure: in November, 5 parents attended; in January, none came. "But, you keep pushing!" added Charity.

In summary, Mr. Love saw how to utilize program to get maximum benefit out of the program and the university.

Headmaster Interview

Mr. Love was a graduate of the city's school system. He went on to college, "but, for the wrong reason," he admitted; he attended a college that was ranked #1 in the nation in basketball on a basketball scholarship, and hoped to go on to play professional basketball. Mid-year, he returned home and was given a different direction, by an uncle who was a minister, and enrolled in a small, religious college in the rural, western part of Massachusetts as a theology major with an education minor. Although he completed his practicum in student-teaching, he did not apply for his teacher certification. He became, instead, an educational counselor with the Department of Youth services and worked his way up to Case Work Manager. He went on to receive a Master in Criminal Justice degree in a large, private university in this city. After seven years, he felt burned out and disillusioned in dealing with youngsters who were almost always "on a dead-end track;" he turned to the city's school system as an excellent vehicle to make an impact on youth. He worked as administrative assistant to the superintendent as "trouble shooter . . . handling desegregation and community issues" and as assistant headmaster in a local, city high school that was having the most difficulty integrating Black youngsters into the traditionally all-White school. In 1982, he was asked to assume the position of headmaster at the high school that is the subject of this study. He was told that, "It was the opportunity to turn the school around . . . . The school was at the bottom and couldn't get any worse."

Identifying the Problems

In 1980, when Mr. Love was first offered the position, he began his assessment of the school and its problems. He visited the school and toured the building with the long-time headmaster who, at that point, was burned out; he learned that "he was worn out by the grievances of the faculty; the school had gotten by him; he felt that, at this junction, new leadership was needed." The headmaster

shared his concerns and the problems he had experienced. But, when Mr. Love's appointment was withdrawn, due to internal politics, he returned to his position as assistant headmaster at the nearby high school. Two years later, after the retirement of the long-time headmaster and the brief administrations of two more headmasters at this troubled school, he was approached, again, to take the position. Colleagues and security personnel who had been at the school tried to discourage him from taking the position, describing it as . . .

> a zoo. . . Kids were all over the place and wouldn't listen to anybody. Students would cut classes and roam the hallways; large numbers of students would congregate in the halls and stairways, smoking marijuana in the bathrooms. Students would turn off the lights in the hallways . . . ride bicycles . . . . It was a school that faculty did not want to come to . . . . There were horror stories of teacher assaults and teachers locking themselves in the teachers' rooms.

After three weak administrators, teacher morale was very low. There had not been anyone for them to turn to for support in many years. Everyone described a school out of control--" . . . a picture of a bad school in a bad neighborhood." Mr. Love agreed to take the position, adding: "There wasn't a whole lot I could do about the neighborhood, but, there was a lot I could do about the school."

Mr. Love agreed to take the position--but, on the condition that he could remove the existing administrators and replace them with "his own people," as he called them; he brought with him a female assistant who, in his estimation, was "good with details and understanding how curriculum operates, and, a male assistant with a strength in handling discipline." Mr. Love felt that it was important to bring two people whom he knew he could trust: "In a new building, you have to know that certain people are going to support you." He knew that he had to wait for people to build trust--wait for people to get to the point where they trusted him.

Responding To Teacher Needs to Improve Morale

Mr. Love knew the state of the people who were left in the school: they were totally disgusted; they did not trust any administrator who came into the position after the merry-go-round that they had been having with prior administrators. He knew that the Black headmaster, who had replaced the long-time headmaster, had alienated the entire staff from each other. At that point, the staff was half-White, half-Black. Upon his transfer, a White administrator stayed for a year and was then transferred. Neither was very visible in the school; neither was able to provide

leadership for teachers or students. Mr. Love asked a long-time teacher at the school to take a position as assistant headmaster in order to assist in the transition. For personal reasons, he declined the offer, but, agreed to take on the duties without the official title.

Mr. Love spent the summer at the teachers' pool--recruiting new teachers, interviewing teachers whom he did not know--attempting to put together a staff to fill the 30 vacant positions (about half the staff). "The fortunate thing was that "half the staff had transferred out, so a new half coming into the building was as new as I was," he added. He made some changes in department heads; some voluntarily left; others, he asked to leave, because, he said, "We clashed!". . . to clash would be an unhealthy situation." Mr. Love began to articulate his vision:

> I tried to bring people who could work together--people who had common goals and objectives . . . not that they had to agree with me. It was important that they were all working <u>for</u> kids. My most important goal was making sure that . . . the people who were in the classroom were the people I would want teaching <u>my</u> child.

The opening day's meeting with staff was crucial in Mr. Love's plan; he stated that the key was "structure"--making sure that he opened the school communicating that he was well-organized. He

surrounded himself, administratively, with well-organized people: there was a staff handbook, a schedule to follow, an agenda to the meeting. He wanted people to know that there was a plan; the purpose of the meeting was to accomplish things, not to argue and bicker. One of the things that Mr. Love knew was, that the long-time headmaster used to get "killed" at faculty meetings, as he phrased it, because he did not have an agenda; he let the meeting open up to any subject.

Mr. Love was "tested" by everyone--even the custodians, he said amusingly. The custodians that other administrators were unable to control and who continued to defy him, he was able to have replaced. Many others did not work out until some did come who were willing to take direction from him. Mr. Love did not want to come into a dirty building and he knew that teachers and students felt the same way. The school opened with the graffiti off the walls of the corridors and the classrooms. In the main corridor a gigantic graffiti board was mounted, which was the only place that students were free to express themselves, if necessary. During the Christmas vacation, he got a group of students together to help him paint the institutional beige and brown doors to blue on the first floor.

It was important to open the school with the faculty feeling that they knew that the new headmaster was in charge. There was a lack of, on the part of the faculty, having trust in <u>any</u> administrator. As much as the students needed to see who was running the school, the faculty needed to see who was running the school.

From the beginning, he decided that he was going to be very visible in the school and have an open door policy for both teachers and students. He further articulated his vision for himself and others: ". . . to be fair and to have rules that we all could live by and all follow the rules;" one of the things that he tried to do, then, is "lead by example, not just what I say." He stated that he intended to bring the school under control, bring order to the corridors and classrooms, by being out there "leading by example." He did not ask anyone--teachers or students--to do something that he did not do himself--even if it meant cleaning the cafeteria tables or picking up trash from the floor. He was in the school early every morning, an hour to an hour and a half before school opened, in order to be better prepared when students came in to school. He was there to exemplify the philosophy that he continued to describe: "I don't want to walk in just before the bell as if I didn't care. I want people to

know what I stand for." The students saw who was running the school. There had been a lack of anyone being assertive, anyone being able to stand up to students and just tell them "No" in the prior years. His first priority was discipline--bringing order to the corridors and classrooms. His second priority was to try to establish confidence in the administration and faculty--to convey to students and faculty--that they [the administration and faculty] knew what they were doing (even though this was the first time he had opened the building.) He admitted to . . .

> uncertainty . . . and . . . not knowing how to do a lot of things . . . but, we went forward with a total commitment that we were doing this to better the school and make the school a better place for everyone.

Mr. Love stated his vision for the school staff: " . . . to allow the faculty the opportunity to make the decisions as well as to carve out their own niches." He concluded that, over the years, this has taken place to the extent that people have taken on various projects, not because he asked, but because they wanted to take the initiative. The senior college prep enrichment class was the initiative of the guidance counselor who responded to the need for students to be individually guided through the college admissions process. The

class brought teachers and support staff to work together more closely, supporting not only students, but each other in the process of motivating students to pursue higher education. The nationwide award to the school, the Drug-Free School Award, was the result of the initiative of individual teachers. The Career Day with companies was accomplished through staff initiative. People have felt empowered to bring in programs. "They weren't hesitant; they knew how I felt and that I wouldn't say 'No'," concluded Mr. Love. The drug program, the grief program were both staff-initiated attempts to help youngsters. People knew what they did well, and they felt good about bringing in programs and services. Mr. Love did add that " . . . all programs still have to come through me." He wanted to be kept informed of everything going on in the school. He stated that he has seen that the annual Thanksgiving dinner for the elderly "fills a major void in the seniors lives, and . . . a major void in youngsters' lives, as well; it makes a lot of adults feel better about ourselves [sic] when we can do something for others." The dinner has been given for the past nine years, growing from 200 to over 1200 senior citizens who have taken part in the celebration. Mr. Love stated that he wishes that he could find someone to underwrite the $5,000-

$6,000 cost so that the money that the school raises could be used for other things, for example, counseling services. Raising money for the dinner has been a year-round effort of staff members. One fault of the school department has been that there is a lack of discretionary funds allocated to schools.

Although Mr. Love encouraged people to confer with him informally, there was a formal body regarding how issues were resolved and contact was maintained between the administration and staff as a whole--the faculty senate that every school should have, according to union contract. Most of the time, problems were resolved, immediately, at the school level. According to the Boston Teachers' Union, this school has had fewer grievances, fewer problems than any other school in the school system.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

Mr. Love reflected on the process of taking control of the direction of students:

> I had to hold 'mirrors' up. Sometimes, with mirrors, people think you have much more than what you have. That's what I did with the kids. If they'd say to me, 'Who do you think you are? Ain't nobody gonna tell me 'No'!' I would show them what 'No' meant."

Mr. Love was always visible in the corridors to personally deal with the manifestation of student behavior problems. He had an organization around him as well: the male assistant headmaster whom he brought with him, a long-time security officer and other hand-picked security personel, and key staff members who were given specific assignments. When it was necessary to call the police, it was done--in order to set an example that he intended to get the school under control. He did not have to call them often or for very long. Along with his firm, consistent discipline came his verbal and non-verbal philosophy. What Mr. Love learned from his own high school experiences shaped his vision of his role as headmaster in dealing with students:

> What I remember is, not knowing my principal. He was someone who sat in the office; he had no relationship to me. I want my kids to know what I stand for . . . what kind of school I want . . . . I want them to know that they can come to me . . . . I may say 'No' to them, but I also explain why I have to say 'no'. I deal with them openly and fairly . . . treating them all the same way . . . consistent[ly].

Once the school was under control, Mr. Love, his administration, staff, and the people he encouraged to become part of the school community went through a process of assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the academic curriculum and developed

a core course that allowed the students a balance of academics and cultural enrichment. Originally, Mr. Love recalled, the school was beginning to accomplish his vision of a three-tier academic system: an honors program for the gifted and talented students, a college -bound program, and a business curriculum. As the years progressed with budget cuts, he could not afford the staff to service the small honors classes of 10-15 students. He was first to acknowledge the value of the university programs, the gifted and talented program and the Upward Bound Program, which has given the students the enrichment that the school has not been able to offer.

Year after year, budget cuts have taken the balance of academic and cultural enrichment out of his control. He expressed concern for the direction in which the school may be forced--just offering the required courses to satisfy city-mandated graduation requirements (more than what the state requires). With budget cuts, the school may not be able to provide the assistance that students need to fulfill required courses. For the third year, the school has been functioning with one guidance counselor. There have always been many border-line seniors who have needed individual, personal, and academic support; the counselor identified the need to the

faculty and asked for volunteers to mentor seniors in their classes. Twenty-five faculty members and administrators, including Mr. Love, volunteered to mentor 1-5 at-risk seniors.

Mr. Love recognized the need to bring in outside agencies to support the school in addressing the needs of youngsters. The needs of students have been so broad that the school needed all the professional help that agencies could provide. Sometimes, when Mr. Love has looked at the number of services provided by agencies, he stated, "the school seemed to be like a multi-service center": the doctor from the community health center who has been the key member of the SST, the representative of the drug and alcohol support agency, the representative in support of pregnant students, the agency who has been working with the school nurse and the peer support group in dealing with death (due to the large number of violent deaths in the community), the counselors from the university partner who have supported special education students and their problems, the counselor from the nationwide Talent Search Program who have provided educational counseling, the counselor of the program that represented the coalition of businesses that supported funding financial aid for college, etc..

Mr. Love has placed high value on higher education for students as the means to better themselves. Mr. Love expressed confidence in the guidance and direction that students have been given when he boasted of 50-70% of the graduating class enrolling in some form of higher education. This fact has often been quoted in articles about the school; to outsiders, it was a measure of how the school has been servicing students.

Mr. Love understood the personal problems that have been barriers to students being successful academically. He sanctioned the waiver policy that allowed students to make-up the assignments and tests missed due to absences. He encouraged them to take the after-school classes to make up the credit lost in failed classes. For students who are over-age and behind grade level, students who had quit school and returned, Project Lifeline was created to support students in completing the required courses in 2-3 years rather than 4 years. Many of these students had family commitments (children of their own) and, after quitting school realized that they needed a high school diploma in order to enter the work force; others still aspire to go on to college once they have dealt with their personal issues.

In the past, when students were more prone to fight, a prominent female doctor who lived in the community, piloted a violence prevention program in the health classes. The program has been on-going, but there has been an evident need to expand it; the issue, again, has been man-power. Although Mr. Love readily identified student needs, he, unfortunately, had to work within the constraints of budgetary cuts. Mr. Love has received calls from schools nationwide regarding the program; it was ironic that, with the recognition of the need for violence prevention programs, funding was not offered to support school efforts to meet that need.

In addition to a balance of academic and cultural enrichment of course offerings, Mr. Love recognized the need for student activities. He believed in giving the students an opportunity to participate in activities that they enjoyed. He saw activities as a tie-in to academics--a means to encourage analysis and problem-solving. He envisioned every student learning how to play chess. One period every week has been set aside as activity period and students have taken part in a variety of activities that have been of interest to both students and teachers. Mr. Love acknowledged that "kids can work better with other kids;" they just needed adults to give them

some direction. Although there was a formal student council, students tended to communicate with him informally. The teacher-student initiatives in drug awareness activities, peer leadership activities with elementary school children as tutors and Big Brothers, the grief support program, activities with the elderly (visiting nursing homes and working at the Thanksgiving dinner, and taking part in the district parade were all the activities "that helped people to feel better about themselves what they can do for others," according to Mr. Love.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

One of the first topics that Mr. Love discussed, with people within and outside the school, was a vision for the school--where they wanted the school to go. Part of the direction of that vision came from his former boss, the superintendent of schools, who suggested exposing the youngsters to the latest technologies, making sure that students had every opportunity and advantage to take their places in society. That began the shaping of, as he stated, " . . . the vision of making the school a computer magnet high school and making the school one of the best schools in the school system." The vision was to make the school a school of which students would

be proud. Students "standing up and defending their school to other students, relations, and adults is an indication of how they feel about the school," he added. It has taken years, he stated, "to live down a bad reputation . . . the bad connotation of the location of the school."

When Mr. Love first arrived, there was a great deal of resentment in the community. There was a great deal of resentment among the faculty with regard to outside agencies. According to Mr. Love, one of the things that he had to do was "go out and mend a lot of bridges" and try to bring the community and school into a better relationship. Many of the community groups and agencies were disenchanted with the school and he felt that for the school to be successful it had to have better rapport with the people and agencies in the community. He immediately put together a coalition of agencies and school people and called it a school collaborative. Although there were prior attempts to involve community and agency support, there had not been a "framework" in the school--<u>how</u> to use this support. He gave them a framework: a place out of which to work, an outline of specifics that the school wanted them to do, and made it clearly understood that the agencies had to work closely

with school staff. The collaborative grew to include as many as 15 agencies working within the framework; it was a gradual process of the faculty accepting agencies in the school. This concept was initiated by Mr. Love, by choice. In a few years, the state would mandate a School Improvement Council (SIC) and Student Support Team (SST), concepts that he had already put into practice. Unfortunately, with cutbacks at the agency level, many agencies have become involved on a limited basis. "Lack of counseling from professionals is a real problem; we need more . . . . .," he added. The SIC as a structure or catalyst for bringing people together met monthly and provided the opportunity to bring representatives of constituencies together, at the same table, to talk about the same issues. A gourmet breakfast, served by the special needs food service instructor, brought <u>all</u> members to the early morning meeting <u>faithfully</u>.

The university and business partners' services have been varied and on-going to all members of the school community. The university supported students in academics and counseling at the university site through its two student support programs for the school's talented and gifted and the Upward Bound program, and, at

the school site through the new guidance class and tutoring for 9th grade students, and the AGP. The university has supported teachers in their work in the classroom by providing the opportunity for them to receive grant moneys to better address the needs of the classroom. The grants provided university faculty consultant-support to teachers. The university has been generous in extending use of their facilities for events such as the school's 50th birthday celebration which was important in early efforts to rekindle ties with the community and alumni. Sports facilities have been made available, which helped in keeping school contact with other schools, especially those from the suburbs. Business partner support has also benefited everyone in one way or another. Although the budget is only $5,000, the company has tried to make up for the allowance by giving the school furniture, desks, equipment, supplies that are no longer of use to the company. An annual book-drive encouraged company employees to recycle their books by donating them to the school library. Unfortunately, the library was just closed when the position of librarian had to be cut. Company consultants shared their expertise in marketing and recruitment strategies with school staff. The company provided the financial support to re-decorate the

library and to set up the Office of the Future. Unfortunately, the entire business department was cut out last year. Full-time and part-time jobs are offered to our students at the company site. Many of these students have taken advantage of the mentor program with company employees and the partnership has received national recognition as one of President Bush's "Points of Light." Many staff members have taken advantage of the computer and management seminars at the company site, to assist them in becoming as computer literate as the students, since the school has been designated as the computer magnet school in the school system. Their facility has been extended to the senior class every year for the graduation ceremony.

We have taken a multitude of avenues in parent outreach: by grade level, on Saturdays, on Sundays, afternoons, evenings, mornings. Early morning seemed to be the best time, although the school still has not had the participation that it should be getting. The school has tried raffles, gift certificates, dinners, breakfasts. According to Mr. Love, the success seemed to depend on getting people with the "fire"--but, there have been very few; once each of these individuals has left, "we lose the fire," and there has not been

someone else to immediately carry on with that same drive. The few parents who have become involved have proven that they have been able to make an impact: the first parent council fought to make the school a computer magnet school--carrying the fight right to the superintendent's office. For the second year, the school, again, has had a parent who has that drive to work with school staff in parental outreach.

Mr. Love had a vision, from the beginning, for the school <u>not</u> to be at the bottom in terms of public perception in the school system. In striving to change the direction of the school, he knew that the process would have to begin with the people <u>in</u> the school viewing the school differently, then to make others realize, as he described the process, that "Yes, we do have a school; we are not a zoo; we are a normal high school." By word-of-mouth, the faculty told other faculty; people started to call, saying that they wanted to teach here. The department of personnel has told Mr. Love that he had one of the lowest rates of people wanting to transfer elsewhere. One year, three people wanted to transfer--the largest number since he began his tenure. By word-of-mouth, students told other students why they wanted to come here. The students have been part of the

official recruitment team, with teachers, who have visited middle schools in the spring with a video and oral presentation of what the school has to offer. The many student activities with outsiders have affected how the school has been perceived. Parents, unfortunately, have been given mixed messages from their children, i.e., when students have to go home without books because the school has not had enough books for every student.

Mr. Love learned, from experience, that it was difficult to get the media to respond to positive stories about the school. When reporters called him when a student terrorized someone, to talk about weapons, violence, or the drop-out rate, he reminded them that he could not get them to come out to the school to give coverage to the Thanksgiving dinner or the many positive events for which he was actively seeking publicity.

> I used to purposely try to get the media involved so the school could get positive publicity. I put pressure on people who I felt 'owed me'--to do articles of a positive nature on kids--so that people could look at our school differently.

He acknowledged that people read the newspaper and believed what they read; if they read about violence in the community, they associated the violence with the school itself. Mr. Love pulled out a

check, a $200.00 donation, that he had just received in the mail from a couple in the suburbs who read an article about the school in a major city newspaper. "When people see that we're pulling up from the bottom, the perception changes." He added, philosophically, "Mirrors! We still do a lot of things with mirrors!"

The only thing that Mr. Love could not do with mirrors was to apply the strategy to staffing. He has always been in the position of having to make cuts in staffing--the librarian, a guidance counselor, department heads, and an entire business department; staff reductions, in turn, has affected programs, services, and facilities. He added,

> Cutbacks . . . It's always on my mind . . . . I think about running a school with only one of everything: one secretary, one guidance counselor, one assistant headmaster . . . and it scares me.

He felt that school department people did not understand what it took to run buildings. People, sitting behind desks, who made decisions based on numbers alone, could not imagine what it was like to go into a classroom to teach 30-35 youngsters with a range of abilities, ranging from special needs to college bound, and trying to give them all the attention that they need.

Summary

This is a study of school change in an inner-city high school. It is a study of people and relationships in the formal and informal structure of the school.

The study necessitated a review of the prechange period in order to understand the issues that negatively affected the school. The change process is reconstructed through interviews with representative participant-observers who described the process through the daily experiences of people who inhabited or were associated with the school as partners in education. The study reveals the process of effecting change by responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve staff morale, student morale and public perception.

The data evidence elicited is revealing of the style of the headmaster, the role of staff, the extent of university / business partner involvement, the extent of parental / community involvement, and the interactive processes of constituents. It is evident that principals cannot effect change alone. This study explores the role of the headmaster as the primary "initiator" of the change process whose crucial role is "mobilizing" people to become

"implementers" of the change process" (Fullan 1991). The data evidence will be analyzed to determine the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change.

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The data evidence of the study, elicited through interviews with representative participants of the change process at this school, reveals the process of effecting change by responding to teacher needs, student needs, and school needs in order to improve staff morale, student morale, and public perception. The data evidence also reveals the style of the headmaster, the role of teachers and staff, the extent of university / business partnership involvement, and the extent of parent / community involvement which are then analyzed within the framework of Fullan's (1991) three phases of the change process: (1) initiation, (2) implementation, and (3) continuation (to include outcomes) to determine the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change (Fullan 1991, 47-48). Through a comparison with pertinent existing literature, determinations are made regarding what is consistent with previous research findings and what is not consistent. Based on the data evidence and analysis, recomendations will be made to further the change process.

Identifying the Problems

By 1981, the young, new teachers were 10 plus years older and the cumulative effects of the continuous changes of the 1970's had taken its toll. The following is an analysis of the problems from within and from outside the school and the effects on teacher morale, student morale and public perception.

Lack of Safety

The neighborhood and school became increasingly unsafe as drugs and violence increased. The location of the school made it easily accessible to outsiders. With budget cuts by the school department after the desegregation of schools was implemented, security personnel and administrative support were reduced, giving way to student unlawful activities going unchecked. Fearful of their safety, teachers left the school promptly at the end of the school day.

While in school, they were only concerned with what happened in their classrooms; they were less visible outside the classrooms. A safe and orderly environment, the necessary foundation for learning to take place, had to be restored.

Lack of Discipline

Discipline problems increased as school department budget reductions affected staffing: the number of teachers was reduced and transferred; teachers on supportive assignments, i.e. deans of discipline, were returned to the classroom; the number of administrators was reduced as new administrators were appointed by the school department; the number of security personnel was reduced. Student behavior problems escalated as school personnel were unable to confront student and staff issues. Unable to change student negative behavior, and for lack of administrative support in dealing with behavior problems, disruptive students were often sent to the library. The manifestations of students' problems had to be addressed and students had to be given a positive direction to channel their interests and behavior.

Lack of Trust in Leadership

As discipline problems increased, staff expectations for administrative support heightened. A series of headmasters were neither able to respond to teacher concerns nor give direction to a mutual focus on the problems and their resolution. The long-time headmaster did not have the support from within or without [school

department] and retired. The two headmasters over the next 1-1/2 years were neither able to give direction to students nor to staff. They were unable or unwilling to relate to either group as was evidenced by their lack of visibility in the school. The effect on teachers was to blame and confront administrators in anger or to withdraw emotionally and ignore what was happening. A need was established for strong leadership to give a positive direction to students and staff.

Lack of Internal Communication Leading to Isolation

As school department budget reductions eliminated financial support for after school and weekend social activities, the opportunities that brought staff together with students were no longer there. The teachers remained in their classrooms without social interaction with each other or with students. The lack of the positive relationship between teachers and students affected the role of the teacher. As discipline problems increased and could not be controlled by staff or administration, staff turnover escalated yearly; by 1982, half the staff had transferred. In order for school improvement to take place, there must be a comprehensive approach to the interactive process.

Lack of Student and Staff Stability / Lack of Support Services.

The student turnover of 1968 brought new students assigned by the school department. They were mainly from the housing projects and came with the problems of a changing inner-city society: more poverty, more single parent homes, pregnancy, and drugs. Teachers were beginning to be trained (sensitivity sessions) to deal with the new problems. Specialized support staff did not begin until the mid 1970's with special education. Teachers had to learn how to incorporate skills other than those related to academics in their classrooms. The need was established to develop a stronger internal support network and to incorporate an outside support network. With the desegregation of schools at the same time, a more diverse student body was assigned, but the school never became racially balanced, even with yearly reassignments of students. There were waves of new immigrant groups with new problems to address: the conflict between West Indian Black students and American Black students, the lack of schooling that necessitated intensive basic skills services, and the Asian students who refused bilingual education but still needed support services. Teachers became frustrated trying to deal with the varied individual

needs in the large classes, with little or no outside support. The instability of staff and student populations due to desegregation and internal conditions did not facilitate the formation of relationships.

Lack of External Communication / Poor Public Perception

There were sporadic internally-generated outreach efforts as well sporadic externally-generated efforts to become involved with the school in efforts to solve its problems. The lack of commitment from within and from outside the school was evident.

When teachers were new, young, and energetic, they were more proactive in parental outreach efforts. Even then, there would be just a few parents who were the driving forces and cooperative efforts to recruit more parents were never successful. A few community agencies had their own agendas for their involvement with the school. The business partner concept had just been initiated in the city in the mid 1970's; the focus was on getting jobs for students. By the end of the 1970's, the university partnership began with Teacher Corps, in an attempt to support staff in addressing the serious problems of the school. When funding ran out, the initiative was dropped. School department support amounted to sending headmasters, in a trial and error approach, to

turn the school around. The school's reputation in the school system was infamous. Its notoriety was fueled by media coverage who reported the negative happenings within and outside the school. The main concern of teachers was day-to-day self-survival until they were able to transfer.

Lack of Purpose / Lack of Pride / Affecting Morale.

There were not reasons for staff or students to say that they were proud to be associated with the school. The school was lacking a purpose for its existence and for the people within. The activities that had brought people together were gone; there were not sports teams; traditional senior activities were nonexistent; awards and ceremonies to reward accomplishments were not there. Morale of both students and teachers was low: there was neither a purpose to being there nor confidence in the future.

The Process of Change

The phases of the change process underlie the single most important idea that has been supported by leading researchers that: "change is a process, not an event (Fullan & Park, 1981; Hall & Loucks, 1977)," (Fullan 1991, 49). The total time frame of the process of change is lengthy--from 3-5 years to as many as 5-10

years. In the case of the school in this study, the process has been evolving for ten years.

Phase I: Initiation

Initiation of change may emanate from many different sources, for varied reasons, and in response to varied needs. In this study, the events leading up to the need for change in this school have been documented. The school department threatened to close the school unless change was effected. The new headmaster of the school assumed the responsibility and made a commitment to give a new direction for the school, teachers, students, and the community (parents, agencies, university / business partners).

The initial planning of change began with the appointment of a new headmaster in the summer of 1982 and his preparation for the job that began well in advance of the opening of school. A period of information-gathering from reliable, primary source individuals associated with the school provided the new headmaster with an understanding of the problems of the school, staff, and students, their strengths and weaknesses. As an active initiator, the headmaster had a vision for the direction of the school and the people within and associated with it. He got the process underway

in a positive direction by identifying two priority issues: (1) restoring safety and discipline and, (2) restoring trust, i.e., staff trust in the headmaster and student trust in staff and the headmaster.

Other issues, which were articulated as part of the headmaster's vision, were to allow staff to become part of the decision-making process and to allow staff to take initiatives. These factors, although articulated from the beginning did not get activated until the change process had begun.

Phase 2: Implementation

This phase takes the most time and is the means to achieving certain outcomes. The headmaster articulated common goals for everyone: a student-centered philosophy of education and a school-centered improvement goal. The headmaster conveyed his intent of making the school a better place for everyone by establishing order and discipline. He also conveyed his willingness to include others in the process of effecting change, i.e., power-sharing or empowerment: staff, students, and partners in education were mobilized to become part of the process as their needs were being met and morale began to improve.

Responding to Teacher Needs to Improve Morale

A strong, take-charge leader gave direction to the change process that began with teachers. Change efforts began with the development of more positive relationships among the adults in the school. The headmaster shared a sense of purpose and gave a future direction for teachers to channel their efforts.

Theme: Vision-Building. The headmaster and the people within and associated with the school had an early shared vision of what the school could look like; they all chose to be there--for some of the long-time staff, that vision is what kept them going through the difficult times. The direction for sharing the vision for the process of change began with the headmaster who felt that everyone had to perceive immediate changes:

The process of restoring trust began prior to the opening of school. The remaining staff had been alienated from each other by the previous headmasters, personally and professionally, and had to regain trust in each other again as well as another headmaster. The headmaster had to begin with an immediate organization, albeit small, whom he knew he could trust and would be supportive. Then, he could spend time and patience developing mutual trust and

cooperation with and among others. The former administrators were transferred and were replaced by two assistant headmasters of his choosing, personal and professional colleagues from his former school, and a long time teacher at the new school to be a third assistant headmaster. Serving as liaison between the new administration and faculty, he spent the summer taking phone calls from anxious teachers and reassured them of the personal and professional attributes of the new headmaster and his assistants. He had confidence in them and tried to build up the confidence of his colleagues before the opening of school. The headmaster personally interviewed prospective teachers to fill the 30 vacant positions and selected people whom he felt had (1) common goals and objectives that focused on students, and (2) the ability to work harmoniously with peers and students. A more diversified group of teachers was brought into the school: Black, White, females, males, and more younger teachers.

At the opening staff meeting, people needed to see immediate, visible changes to signify that this was the beginning of the positive, future direction of the school. They saw a clean school, free of litter and graffiti. They saw the beginning of structure and

organization that conveyed that the headmaster was organized and in control. The headmaster and his assistants were well organized and conveyed a purpose; they had a schedule that was followed, an agenda to the meetings, and handouts. Meetings became the key organizational structure of the school.

The teachers needed to have a sense of purpose for being there--a need for confidence in the future as it related to them personally and professionally. The headmaster began the meeting by stating why he and his assistants were at the school: he and they chose to be there; it was not just a job. He conveyed that he and they were there for them, and, the vision that, they were all there for the students. He intended to make the school a safe place for both staff and students; it was their responsibility to teach. The headmaster focused on how he intended to support teachers who wanted to teach. He offered them the security to stay: it was their school; he would allow them to do things that they enjoyed doing and that were positive for students. He gave them the option to leave if they did not share a common vision of the purpose of school. There were some dissenters among faculty and department heads who clashed with the headmaster--and he considered that unhealthy; they were

given the option of leaving voluntarily or being transferred. He wanted to broaden the circle of support for teachers through his assistant headmasters. Each of the assistant headmasters displayed strengths to complement his: one was good with details and knowledgeable about curriculum issues; another assistant's strength was in the area of discipline; the third assistant, the liaison, knew the staff and students well and the everyday details of the school. The headmaster defined for everyone, including himself, the purpose for being there and their future direction. Strong leadership is what people needed to get refocused on what they wanted to do. The headmaster admitted to uncertainty because he was never in charge of a school before; but he had the commitment to better the school and to make it a better place for everyone.

The teachers had a basic need for safety. The on-going building of trust developed as the safety and discipline issue was addressed. Teachers were told that during the summer a letter was sent home to students and parents introducing the new headmaster and defining school expectations, rules, and the consequences of breaking the rules. A framework of order and discipline allowed both students and teachers to develop relationships that were

mutually beneficial within and outside the classroom, i.e., related to personal growth as well as academic and professional growth. When school opened, staff visibly saw how situations were handled. The teachers had to see that the headmaster who conveyed a student-centered philosophy was strong, fair, consistent in enforcing rules and following through with consequences for infractions. They had to see that he was supportive of teachers. The headmaster was given whatever he needed to bring the school under control; he had hand-picked the several security personnel and support staff with strengths in handling discipline problems. First, building security prevented outsiders who did not belong in the school from coming in to terrorize people. The headmaster, security personnel, and administrative and support personnel were clearly visible in the corridors at all times and moved students into the classrooms. Students who insisted on not going to class were taken to the disciplinarian's office. The headmaster had community, school department, and criminal justice personal contacts and was able to discharge serious offenders or have them arrested. Problems were dealt with in the presence of the concerned teacher and groups of students to lend credibility to his intentions.

Theme: Evolutionary Planning. The force of the headmaster's personality was perceived immediately by teachers and students. Quiet-spoken, he did not have to raise his voice to command attention. With the strong discipline and consistency necessary to take control of the school came his caring attitude; he wanted what was best for everyone. He did not dwell on negativity; he verbally acknowledged the many "good kids" for whom he and the people in the school were there, conveying that they all had that potential.

Attitude changes began almost immediately: teachers came out of their classrooms more and stood at their doorways as students entered; student behavior problems lessened. Students saw in him the Black male role model that they needed in their lives: the father, grandfather, brother, uncle, teacher. It was the beginning of building student confidence in the administration and teachers as caretakers; they were there to take care of students. Both students and staff, initially, needed someone to be in control. As safety and discipline were reestablished and trust was being developed, resolving other issues furthered changes in teachers and students that made them more in control. The early solitary control of the headmaster gave way to allowing others to become active

participants in the implementation of change. In order to be fair to everyone, rules that all could live by and follow were conveyed through the headmaster's leadership style.

The headmaster encouraged communication and brought people out of isolation through leadership by example. He did not ask anyone--teachers or students--to do anything that he did not do himself. He picked up trash and cleaned off cafeteria tables. He brought order to the corridors and classrooms by being visible in the school corridors, in the cafeteria, at the door at the beginning and end of the day, and in the classrooms to substitute for teachers when they could not be there. He encouraged communication by initiating conversations as he made his rounds through the building, taking a personal as well as professional interest in people. People were encouraged to meet him in his office for more personal conversations as he established an open door policy. He encouraged an attitude of school being a place to want to come to by being there an hour to an hour and a half before school opened and, just as long if not longer, at the end of the day. He carried out his job, primarily, within a social framework--through interactions with individuals and groups. Teachers and students knew he was sincere and

responded to him. He clearly understood and respected the everyday work of the classroom teacher because he was always out there with them.

As teacher attitudes changed, student attitudes changed. Teachers smiled more and communicated with each other more--on a professional level rather than social. They never were, or ever became, a faculty that socialized together outside of school. Unlike Stagg High School, teachers did not have the financial backing of a school system that allowed professional days or weekend retreats in beautiful settings to develop collegiality and to be given time to brainstorm about making visions reality or to take years to discuss planning and change. Initiatives at this school developed as staff was motivated and as needs were individually or mutually perceived. A new special education program in the school that prepared students for food service careers, provided an extra service to teachers: a pleasant, private, place to have lunch with colleagues. Teachers felt that he cared personally about them and felt supported professionally as well. They became more willing to give back, stretching themselves within and outside the classroom, initiating activities, programs, enrichment classes in which they had an

interest and enjoyed, and, that supported students academically and personally. Teachers encouraged, or were more receptive of, one-to-one interactions with students. Teachers, then, became more in control and assumed a more multi-dimensional role in the school. It was a mutually rewarding experience for everyone.

Theme: Initiative-Taking / Empowerment. From the beginning, the headmaster had a vision of allowing staff opportunities to be involved in decision-making as well as to take initiatives. In contrast to the autocratic leader, the headmaster in this study gave power to people by allowing them to accomplish the things that they thought were important. He mobilized staff and others to become the implementers of change. He never said "No," as long as the idea was workable for the school as a whole and benefited students. Allowing activities that brought people together was important; half the faculty was new that first year and had to get to know each other and the small group that had remained from the prior years. They were not a faculty that socialized after school and professional relationships had weakened; therefore, the activities were conducive to restoring relationships with each other, with students, and with people from outside the school. Activities

bonded people together in common experiences that effected changes in attitudes and behavior among all constituencies.

The headmaster was a leader who acknowledged the human resources in schools by empowering others to become leaders. Power-sharing did not weaken his leadership role in the school; it was enhanced. Sometimes teachers were asked to take on responsibilities; he never told people that they had to do something. People were chosen whom he felt had expertise in an area; then, he let them go. He gave people the opportunity to prove themselves. Solid background and experience in an area were not prerequisites for jobs; interest and willingness were as important. He did not check up on people or pressure them because he knew that they would carry out the tasks. The headmaster and his administration were very accomodating in implementing new ideas, and people were acknowledged for their contributions.

Teachers responded with increased motivation and commitment when they felt that their work was important and was valued. Individuals found their own causes that brought self-satisfaction and, in turn, made them a more positive influence in relating to and supporting others within and outside the school.

Activities filled voids in the lives of people that were helped and filled voids in the lives of the people who did the helping. Fund-raising to support many of the programs and activities was a year-round endeavor. The efforts and events brought people together to renew, develop, and maintain traditions of the school. People developed a sense of community which extended to commitment and loyalty to the work of the school.

There were so many activities and programs that everyone was not aware of all of them. Age and lack of energy were given as reasons for lack of awareness and lack of involvement of some teachers. There were people who were not interested in doing anything extra. Just as there were staff who came to school early in the morning and / or stayed later in the afternoon, there were people who only did their jobs. There was an awareness that some people did more work than others, but it was understood that it was by choice and it did not divide the faculty. It was concluded that school improvement was accomplished through the voluntarism of individuals and small groups. But, everyone came together for the traditional school-wide events and celebrations, in-house and with the community.

The strength of one-to-one relationships allowed for many problems and differences to be settled on an individual basis. Just as there was a faculty senate that represented the staff in policies that affected everyone, there was a student council. There was evidence of mutual respect; most often, the headmaster accepted and implemented recommendations but there were times that he could not--but, he always listened and gave reasons for his decisions. He was consistent with teachers and students alike.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale

The problems and issues related to students, personally and academically, were not being met 10 years ago. There were limited in-house support services and sporadic involvement of outside agencies and parents. Relationships were strained due to the worsening conditions in the school.

Theme: Resource and Assistance Mobilization. The conscious outreach of the headmaster to community agencies and parents to encourage better relations was facilitated by creating structures to bring outsiders and school personnel together on a consistent, regular basis: a school improvement council (SIC) and a student support team (SST). This headmaster, unlike the headmaster of the

Comer (1988) study, did not have to be convinced that power sharing increased his ability to manage the school. He put that theory into practice to encourage mutual in-house and outside support on school and student issues.

The holistic approach to supporting students was credited to the headmaster's non-teacher professional perspective and personal perspective of a Black male who faced the same issues when he grew up in this community. Studies have stressed the importance of building supportive bonds between the student and his home life with school: students needed support in resolving personal problems that affected academic performance.

The professional expertise of the agency members ranged from personal counseling services associated with the student support team to higher education counseling with the guidance department. The structure of regular meetings was an important factor in the success of the team. The agencies supported teachers, as well, by helping students to resolve issues that interfered with academic learning. The classroom teachers, who saw the students on a daily basis and knew them better than anyone else, were valuable resources to the outside agencies and school support staff in

addressing problems. Due to lack of parental support, the teacher / student relationships were an important aspect of the bonding process to the school. As teacher morale improved, attitude changes fostered more positive one-to-one interactions with students. The teachers, in turn, through non-academic initiatives, supported learning experiences that tied-in with academics. Skills were developed in students that made them more in control of situations in their personal, academic, and social lives, within and outside school: i.e., through peer leadership activities, students became empowered as leaders. The programs and activities brought students in contact with the community and their peers. They derived self-satisfaction in helping others: the elderly, elementary school children, and their peers through peer leaderships groups dealing with issues that affected their lives--violence, death, drugs, and pregnancy.

A vision of every student graduating from high school and getting a job or going on to higher education was conveyed by the headmaster. The university partnership began as an enrichment program for select gifted and talented students. A long term commitment, as deemed necessary by leading educators, has been

established through the efforts of, mainly, one person from the university, the director of the enrichment program. Her personal drive for involvement to collaborate with teachers on broader school issues involved her on the school improvement council on a subcommittee attempt to improve school-wide achievement and attendance. Through grants that she procured, new initiatives for a tutorial program for 9th graders and a motivational admissions guaranteed program was intended to be mutually supportive of teacher efforts. A funded teacher for a guidance class worked collaboratively with cluster teachers to reenforce skills deemed necessary for academic and personal success.

The ties with the university were strengthened through an aspect of the grant that brought college faculty and school staff into collaborative ventures that supported staff to better meet the needs of students. The initiative reaffirmed the crucial role of the teacher in educational reform efforts. The early clashing of differing cultures was consistent with literature: the mutual mistrust between school staff and university faculty relative to each other's professional roles as educators. Lacking has been direct and continuous contact between the faculties that develop

more collegial relationships which are the foundation of successful collaborations. Lacking was a university partner representative to serve as liaison on a broader level at the university to convey a desire by teachers to become more involved in the work of the university and to incorporate into the partnership teacher professional growth and personal renewal similar to the University of Massachusetts / Amherst, School of Education with several public school systems. The success of the university involvement was attributed to the personal commitment of the program director.

The business partner supported students mainly through after school and summer jobs. A mentor program at the business site had received national recognition. It financially supported the gifts and awards to students through the SIC attendance and achievement committee. It provided tickets to both staff and students for cultural events. It contributed to teacher professionalism by sponsoring computer and management workshops at the company site, skills that ultimately benefited students. It provided consultants to work with teachers on marketing strategies for recruitment of new students, which benefited the school. Business partner contributions appeared not to have contributed to the

improvement of the daily life of the classroom teacher. The monetary budget was low which was compensated by donations of supplies and equipment. It contributed to redecorating the library and had a yearly company book drive to replenish books.

Both the university program director and the business partner representative were usually on site to attend meetings with individuals or with groups. Lacking was a broader commitment of human resources needed in the schools from the university and business partners at-large.

Staff was more proactive in parental outreach when they were young, energetic, and idealistic. There was also a difficulty in sustaining proactive parents. The few parents who became involved did so when they were motivated by a cause: a student scholarship that would benefit their child, lobbying to keep the school from being closed, lobbying to make the school a computer magnet school, and keeping the school a district school.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception

The negative images of the school had been conveyed to the public by word-of-mouth and reenforced through the mass media. That negative public perception perpetuated feelings of low morale

among staff and students. The process of projecting a changing image by publicizing the daily accomplishments of those from within and with its partners in education, again, brought constituencies together in a shared sense of purpose. The outcomes of change were sustained through defined structures and organization that brought people together in an on-going basis.

Theme: Monitoring / Problem-Coping. An early strength of the headmaster was the structure and organization of regular meetings to share information, to set goals, to discuss problems / issues, and to evaluate results. Internal and external constituencies met monthly to discuss school improvement initiatives through the school improvement council; school staff and agencies met weekly to discuss student needs and problem-solving techniques; the grade 9 cluster met several times a week, with and without students, to monitor and discuss student issues; the alternative program teachers for at-risk students met regularly regarding their student issues.

Unfortunately, entire staff meetings were only monthly and there was not sufficient time to do any real work or to share information on all issues. Weak internal communication, as

indicated in the accreditation review, has been an unresolved issue. Changes have been effected by individuals or small groups rather than large scale.

The central person in the change process was the headmaster. The new headmaster had a vision of making this troubled school the best school in the school system. He was a leader who was a master of identifying resources to successfully carry out his vision. It was an on-going process of building up positive images of the school that involved people within the school and people from outside the school, including the media role in the process. The direction of the process came from the headmaster through the force of his personality and his personal contacts throughout the city.

The headmaster knew that, in order for the school to improve, outsiders had to be involved in the process. He immediately began to mobilize community agencies, universities, businesses, parents, and the community at-large, i.e., the media, to become active participants in supporting school efforts to deal with its own problems.

By word of mouth, staff who were soon satisfied with the changed school climate and their sense of empowerment, due to the

headmaster, told other staff. People, unhappy in other schools, wanted to come to this school to teach. There was very little staff turnover by choice in the past ten years; there were few grievances. Teachers from other schools began to come to the school for after school computer classes to update teaching skills.

By word of mouth, students told friends, siblings, and other students of the safe environment and supportive relationships in the school. Through leadership activities with elementary school children and in city-wide student organizations, students influenced their peers to view the school more positively. Through leadership roles, within the school and outside the school, many became articulate spokespersons with politicians, celebrities, media people, and adults in general. The students were part of the official recruitment team that visited the middle schools in the spring to recruit new students. Recruiting strategies highlighted: computers as an integral part of the curriculum, the 50%-70% college entrance rate, the variety of post-secondary institutions that accepted the graduates, the impressive scholarships, the many academic and personal support services to students, and school awards. Unfortunately, none of these strong points, or any others, could

overshadow the school's location. Students from other areas of the city, especially White students, did not want to come to a school located in this area for any reason.

Community people and parents from outside the school were invited into the school to see a changing school: the school was clean, the students were not roaming the corridors; they were in the classrooms. The headmaster personally met with community agency leaders and parents: there was mutual resentment between staff and community stemming from prior years of turmoil in the school and community. He made them feel welcome by accomodating them--by giving them a place out of which to work, on-site people with whom to work, and the structure of collaborative teams to share ideas and information, mainly, related to student issues. They were not on-site based; therefore, they carried their perceptions of the school back to their agencies and to other schools. Some parents became involved in causes of the school whereby they communicated to politicians and school officials the important role of the school in the community, ie., they were influential in keeping the school open and a district high school, and lobbying for the school to become the city-wide computer magnet school.

The university's gifted and talented program for students was often publicized and the home school was given equal recognition. More students, every year, strove to become members of the program. The university program director publicized the positive aspects to the school through her involvement with middle school students and their parents and gave the incentive of automatically becoming part of the program if the middle school students enrolled in the member high school. The university made available its sports facilities to host visiting sports teams who were fearful of the area surrounding the school.

The business partner publicized its partnership role with the school in its company newsletters. It had an annual book drive to replenish books for the school library, which it had refurbished for the school's 50th birthday. It established a mentor program between company employees and students who worked at the company site which received national recognition as one of President Bush's Points of Light. The partner company, with the job agency, assisted students in finding jobs throughout the city and suburbs. Through one-to-one personal interactions with peers, employers, and customers at job sites, students became agents of changing public

perception. Company marketing consultants gave advice to staff members on the recruiting and publicity committee of the SIC regarding marketing strategies to recruit more students to the school and helped to make a video that was shown at middle schools. Perception by school staff is that financial and human support has decreased rather than increased.

The outreach to the media to publicize the positive happenings at the school began with the the headmaster. He, literally, sought out people who "owed" him to do positive coverage of the students and the school. Through the headmaster, several newspaper reporters and television celebrities championed the cause of the school. They often visited and spoke with students in classes or in informal interviews and wrote human interest stories about the school's inhabitants. The headmaster used his "mirror" theory to fuel the momentum of changing public perception. Perception began to change when people saw that the school was pulling up from the bottom. Even the school department took notice; when there were education programs to be initiated by celebrities, politicians, or business executives, this school became the kick-off point. Perception began to change when people saw that the school was

pulling up from the bottom. The process became a ten year effort of projecting a changing image to the public: an image of how the school wanted to be perceived.

Phase 3: Continuation

Most of the initiatives have been successful because of the investment and commitment of human resources. People from within and outside the school have rebuilt, through personal effort and a time commitment, traditions that have served to bond people together. Innovations that involved staff as initiators and implementers have been sustained unless an outside determinant, i.e., budget reductions affected the status of the program or staffing.

Staff was motivated in administrative meetings to discuss teacher methodology and varied educational issues. Everyone listened and engaged in discussions and planning. Age and lack of energy appeared to be factors that hindered attempts at professional renewal being put into action. Peer support through younger teachers with enthusiasm and energy to carry out ideas was lacking. Schools of Education in universities were encouraged to send student teachers and observers to benefit from the experiences of

long-time teachers and to reciprocate by sharing their new perspectives. Similar to Stagg High School, implementing change that would challenge the teachers' established patterns of teaching was difficult due to an aging faculty who traditionally have been set in their ways and not generally risk-takers.

Morale became higher because there was a sense that teachers were running the school. That was part of the headmaster's vision of allowing staff that opportunity. He reaffirmed the importance of teachers by allowing them to carry out their own visions. The staff became more stable and stronger; few people chose to leave in the past ten years. People knew that he did his best to retain them in their positions. Beyond his control were the layoffs and cutbacks by the school department and the effect on an older staff. These were the factors that had just begun to effect lower morale.

Students became an integral part of the change process through interactions with people from within and from outside the school. They became empowered through peer leadership activities to effect further change.

Students have been supported by the school and outsiders in joint effort in addressing personal issues that have often been

barriers to academic achievement. The school became the primary source of help for students through in-house support services and / or the network of supportive services.

The university program representative for students made a long-term commitment to the school and has given a new direction for university support to teachers through collaborative activities with university faculty. Representatives of community agencies have made a long-term commitment to the school within the constraints of their agency budgets. Parental involvement has been on-going; organizationally it was not successful, but to the extent that parents became involved through their own initiative, it was successful for it indicated that parents felt welcome.

Across all constituencies, the personal commitment of individuals has been the contributing factor to the changing school.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study is to document one kind of school change in order to analyze the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change in an inner-city high school.

The study is based on the assumption that, just as everyone had contributed to the problems, everyone should contribute to the solutions to change in this school. This is a study of the process of people, individually and interactively, from within and from outside the school to effect change. It is, essentially, a process of effecting change first at the school's unique personality level, its atmosphere or culture, which provides the conditions for addressing problems at a deeper level.

The process of change was reconstructed through in-depth interviews with representative participants from within and from outside the school, partners in education, who were participants and observers: they represented teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and the university partner.

The study is based on the theoretical assumptions of effecting change through a process of responding to teacher needs to improve morale, responding to student needs to improve morale, and responding to school needs to improve public perception. The data elicited is revealing of the roles of people, individually and interactively, which were analyzed to determine the influence the different variables of a school culture have on the process of change.

The data was analyzed using as a framework Fullan's three phases of the change process: (1) initiation, (2) implementation, and (3) continuation in order to determine the influences the different variables of a school culture have on the change process.

Conclusions

This study found that the central person in the change process was the headmaster. He remained the key active initiator who enabled people to promote change from within and from outside the school through multiple approaches to school change.

Responding to Teacher Needs to Improve Morale.

The headmaster was a strong, confident leader who first provided the basic needs of order, safety, and discipline. He then restored trust in leadership and student trust in teachers and

administration. Through leadership by example he conveyed his vision for the future direction of people and the school: collegiality, communication, visibility, pride in self and school. He conveyed his vision of allowing teachers to assume leadership roles and responsibilities, i.e., power-sharing or empowerment. Teachers, in turn, voluntarily assumed the key role of initiating, implementing, and carrying out initiatives to promote change. The student and school programs and activities developed from the interests and strengths of teachers in response to student and school issues. The initiatives served to benefit students and the school, but they also revitalized teachers as they brought self-satisfaction. People were given a broad framework within which to work; opportunities were provided for multiple approaches in implementing change, i.e., there was flexibility to accomodate individuals and small groups in formal and informal structures. A sense of community was created that bonded people together in the work of the school as a whole, i.e., to develop school pride. There was a tendency to concentrate on activities outside the academics of the classroom rather than dealing with new perspectives that challenged deeply-ingrained teaching style and curriculum content. Many teachers, too, have

continued to rely on the headmaster and security personnel to keep order and discipline in the corridors rather than taking an active role themselves. University / business partnership involvement appeared not to have affected the everyday work of the teacher in the classroom. There was a sense of a lack of on-going, consistent support--human and financial--from the partner institutions, on a broad scale, to the classroom teacher.

Responding to Student Needs to Improve Morale.

The daily experiences of the school reflected the shared common goals of headmaster and teachers in meeting the needs of students, stimulating their interests, and addressing the problems that were barriers to academic learning. A shared sense of purpose supported education being more than academic learning; there was a focus on meeting the human development needs of youngsters to better prepare them to deal with the personal and social pressures in their everyday lives. An interactive role with teachers, administration, and others, from within and outside the school, gave students a focus on the social dimension of school, which fostered self-satisfaction and self-pride experienced through helping others. Peer leadership activities encouraged responsible roles for students

within and outside the school. The daily experiences in the school supported students in developing their own sense of purpose in their lives and confidence in their future direction. The lack of the family supportive structure has placed the school in the position of meeting the needs that were once dealt with by family and church. The school has had to assume multi-roles that have gone beyond imparting subject matter knowledge.

Individual commitments, rather than institutional commitments of the university and business partners and community agencies, have evidenced a desire for direct involvement in meeting the multi-dimensional roles of education. Teachers were more receptive of services that directly supported students, i.e., tutoring, enrichment programs, jobs, etc., or, school support, i.e., tangible donations or accomodations of facilities. They were less receptive of services if they had to share job responsibilities or if they affected the classroom domain.

Responding to School Needs to Improve Public Perception.

The process was initiated through headmaster outreach to mobilize outside resources in the school's sense of purpose: agencies, community people, parents, university / business partners,

and others (school department, media) whom he welcomed to become part of school efforts to give a positive direction to the school. Structure of meetings brought outsiders together with internal staff and served to promote and publicize the efforts and achievements from within and from outside. Individual efforts gave way to more collaborative initiatives in time.

The headmaster mobilized staff and students in interactive experiences that developed self-pride in accomplishments which then transferred to organizational pride. It was a change process that rebuilt traditions within the school and with outsiders to create a sense of community. Activities and programs that created a sense of community and fostered a sense of tradition led to improvements that became embedded in people and the school. The feeling of pride in self and school was then conveyed to outsiders.

The headmaster fostered a shared goal of projecting a changing image to outsiders. Teachers, staff, and outside resources were mobilized to convey how the school wanted to be perceived. That goal was accomplished by gradually taking the school out of its isolation from the community through opportunities that bonded people together in common experiences which contributed to

personal and organizational growth. The university and business partner involvement in affecting public perception was limited; efforts emanated from individuals rather than broad institutional effort, which would require further investment of financial and human resources from the institutions.

The process of overcoming the negative perception associated with the school's location has been an on-going effort. Changes in public perception have been associated with people who effected change rather than institutional efforts to publicize academic offerings, school facilities, or accomplishments, i.e., number of graduates who have gone on to college. The personality and personal contacts of the headmaster was the primary reason for improvement of public perception.

The outcome was: as the level of school isolation decreased, improved public perception increased.

Recommendations

Although change efforts to improve inner-city schools are multi-dimensional, this study has focused, primarily, on the processes of responding to the needs of teachers and students to improve morale, and the process of responding to school needs to

improve public perception as the means to effect change. Recommendations based on the findings and conclusions are made to further the change process at a deeper level: (1) to reenergize and rechannel teacher initiatives toward teacher methodology and curriculum renewal, (2) to create an academic environment in which both at-risk students and high achievement students can function simultaneously, (3) to develop more mutually supportive roles between the university faculty at-large and school staff by establishing a foundation in collegiality, (4) to improve parent participation by surveying parent opinions regarding ways that they would like to be involved with the school, and (5) to lobby for mutual school department and business / university support for professional development and renewal programs for teachers.

Recommendation For Further Research

At a time when budget reductions are affecting programs and staff mobility thereby interrupting the continuity in the schools, further study on the institutionalization process is needed.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

WRITTEN CONSENT FORM

WRITTEN CONSENT FORM

To: _____
From: Lorraine Carcerano

As you know, I am currently in the process of completing the requirements for a doctoral degree in Education from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. My dissertation will be a study of the change process at our high school. It is entitled "Internal and External Factors Influencing Change at an Urban High School: A Case Study".

More specifically, I am interested in reconstructing the process through the first-hand experiences of people who were at the school prior to and through the past nine years. I am asking you to participate in 2-3 interviews, at your convenience, regarding how you came to your job here, what the job is like, and what it means to work here. My goal is to analyze the materials gathered from your interviews in order to understand better your experiences and those of others who have been part of that process of effecting change.

The materials from your interviews will only be used in my dissertation. I will use neither your name, names of other people, nor the name of the school. The interviews will be audio-taped and later transcribed and typed by me. In final form your interview materials will only be reported combined with the interview materials of the other five participants.

If you do agree now but later change your mind, you may withdraw at any time. You may withdraw your consent to have specific excerpts used by notifying me within 30 days after the interviews.

In signing this form, you are also assuring me that you will make no financial claims for the use of the material in your interviews. You are also stating that no medical treatment will be required by you from the University of Massachusetts should any physical injury result from participating in these interviews.

_____

I, _____, have read the above statement and agree to participate as an interviewee under the conditions stated above.
signature of participant:_____ Interviewer:_____

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

INTERVIEW I

Headmaster / Teacher / University Partner Interview

May I ask you to tell me about yourself and your background as it relates to education?

What was there about your life that led you to education ?

1. Who or what were the influences?

2. What were your own grade school experiences like?
   your college experiences?

3. Did you have other jobs? related to education or not?

4. Were there personal experiences that influenced you?

How did you come to your position here?

5. What were your previous jobs, if any?

6. How were you assigned?

7. How much choice did you have in selecting the school?

8. How much did you know about the school beforehand?

9. How did you go about making the decision to accept?

10. When did you begin your job here?

INTERVIEW I

Parent Interview

Directions: May I ask you to tell me about yourself and your background?

What were you own experiences in school like?

1. Who or what were the influences in your life?

2. How did they affect your attitude toward school?

What kind of jobs have you had in your life?

3. How did you come to those jobs?

4. What did you like about them?

What brought you to the point of having children attend this school?

INTERVIEW II

Headmaster Interview

Directions: I'm going to ask you to reconstruct concrete details about your experiences here in the form of stories about you and your relationships with other members of the school community.

How did you spend the summer prior to the opening of school preparing for the job?

1. Did you have any control over the staffing of the school? Were there many positions to be filled? How were they filled?

2. Did you start off with a "plan" for your job as headmaster--possibly a plan for revitalizing the school?
   (if not written, a mental vision of your personal goals?)

3. How did you go about assessing needs? setting priorities? What were they? (regarding staff, students, parents, the university/business partners, the physical plant)

What was your understanding of the problems of the school?

4. How did you come to that understanding?

5. What did you perceive as the strengths of the school upon which to build?

6. How did you prepare for your first meeting with staff?

7. How did you prepare for the opening days with students?

8. What were the opening days like? (with teachers, with students, others?)

9. What were the demographics of the student body? the staff? administration?

What was your first year like?

10. What were the immediate changes you could make? What did you do to communicate to people that things were going to be different?

11. What were the problems that students had to deal with nine years ago? What was associated with school? What stemmed from outside the school?

12. Were there in-house resources in place to deal with those problems? What were they?

13. When you began your tenure here, what was the extent of outside resources to support students? from the community? the university partner? the business partner?

What student problems or issues intensified in the past nine years? What stemmed from outside the school? from within?

14. What in-house resources developed in response to supporting students in dealing with those problems? academic? personal issues?

15. Do the students have a voice through student governing activities? What are they? Can you recount experiences that illustrate their involvement in planning and decision-making? What is their process for communicating with the headmaster? staff? outsiders?

Describe the staff as you found them nine years ago.

16. Did you have a plan for building staff morale?

17. What were the concerns and issues of teachers nine years ago? What was related to students? to working conditions? to their professionalism? other concerns?

18. Is there a formal structure through which they communicate their concerns or issues? Is that the primary means of communicating with the administration?

19. To what extent are teachers involved in activities outside the classroom?

20. Is there a support network from within or from outside the the school to help teachers regarding what goes on in the classroom? (from peers? administration? university/ business partners? the school system?)

21. Are there structures that serve as a catalyst for bringing people together for planning and decision-making? When and where do they take place? Who is involved? What is the focus?

What have your experiences with the surrounding community been like?

22. What was the status of the school's relationship with the university and business partners as you found it nine years ago? with the community? with parents?

23. What are the experiences that illustrate university support to students? to staff? to the administration? to the school? to parents/community?

24. What is the means of communication between the school and university? between whom? where? how often?

25. What is the extent of university involvement in the daily life of the school? (participation in planning programs? decision-making?)

26. What are the experiences that describe the obstacles in the partnership? human ones? financial? other?)

27. What are the experiences that illustrate business support to students? to staff? to the school as a whole?

28. What is the extent of business involvement in the daily life of the school? (participation in planning programs?)

29. What is the means of communication between the school and the business partner? between whom? where? how often?

30. What are the experiences that describe the obstacles in the partnership? (human ones? financial? other?)

31. What has the school's relationship with parents been like? What has worked and what has not? What are the experiences that illustrate efforts to seek their opinions, involvement in activities, involvement in decision-making?

32. What has the school's relationship with the community been like? What has worked and what has not? What are the experiences that illustrate efforts to seek community involvement in school matters (agencies, business, individuals)?

33. What has the school's standing in the school system been like?

34. What have been the experiences that have affected outside perception of the school--both positively and negatively?

35. What has been the role of the media? (favorable and unfavorable)

36. What do you see as the problems still to be addressed? relative to students? teachers? parents/community? school system? university/business partners?

37. What are the pressures or constraints that you have to work under when attempting policy changes or enforcement from outside the school? community? school system? from within?

38. What is the evidence of morale being higher in teachers and students?

INTERVIEW II

Teacher Interview

Directions: I'm going to ask you to reconstruct concrete details about your experiences in the form of stories that involve you and your relationships with other members of the school community.

What was it like being new to the school?

1. Were you the only new person on the faculty that year?

2. What were the students like? the teachers and other staff? the administration? others? their relationships?

3. What were the demographics of the student body? faculty and other staff? the administration?

4. What were relationships with parents like? the community? outside agencies? university/business partners?

5. What did you do if a student:
was a behavior problem, beyond which you could handle in the classroom? Were there people in the school to whom you could turn? Who or what was available within the school? outside the school?

had emotional or personal problems that interfered with his classwork?

needed special services? enrichment?
tutorial services? alternative programs?

What was it like being here in the 1970's to early 80's?
in the classroom? outside the classroom? outside the school?

6. What attempts were made by people to change things?
from people inside? from outside?

7. What were the obstacles / constraints to change taking place?

8. Amidst all the problems, what did you perceive as the school's strengths? To what extent were positive things happening between school staff (and others) and the "good students"? (academically? sports? school activities? enrichment?)

What were the first evidences of moving forward--that change was beginning to take place? physical? attitudes?

9. What did people do that indicated that attitudes were changing? What did they do differently?

10. What did the headmaster do that affected people's attitudes? (students, teachers, others)

What have you taught over the years?

11. How did you come to teach those classes?

12. What are the student problems you deal with in your classes?

13. What do you do if students are having problems that cannot be dealt with in your classroom? Are there resources available to you and the student? from within? from outside? e.g. academic problems? personal issues?

14. How do the problems that you have been experiencing with students the last few years compare with those of the late 70's to early 80's?

Is there a support system for teachers? formally or informally--from peers? administration? others?

15. Is there a process for communicating concerns or issues? formally or informally?

16. What is the process for requesting assistance in dealing with problems or making referrals? (formal and informal)

17. What is the process for students to communicate with the headmaster? To what extent is there evidence that they are involved in planning and decision-making?

What else do you do in the school?

18. Have you worked with students outside the classroom? in extra-curricular activities? programs? enrichment? sports?

19. Have you worked with other teachers/staff/administration on special committees, programs, assignments? What are the details? What was/is the purpose? Who was/is involved?

What have been your experiences with the surrounding community?

20. What are your experiences with the university partner? Have they been of assistance, directly or indirectly, to (you as) a classroom teacher (e.g., student enrichment services, teacher assistance, school improvement)?

21. Have you experienced obstacles in the partnership? (human ones? financial? other?)

22. To what extent are they involved in the daily life of the school? (Are they on planning committees? Do they work with individuals or a group on an on-going basis? To what extent do they influence decision-making?)

23. What are your experiences with the business partner? Have they been of assistance, directly or indirectly, to (you as) a classroom teacher (e.g., student enrichment services, teacher assistance, school improvement)?

24. Have you experienced obstacles in the partnership? (human ones? financial? other?)

25. To what extent are they involved in the daily life of the school? (Are they on planning committees? Do they work with individuals or a group on an on-going basis? To what extent do they influence decision-making?

26. What is the means of communication between the university (business) partner and the school? between whom? where? how often?

27. What are your experiences with parents? your personal outreach? school outreach? What has worked and what has not?
(What are the examples of school efforts to seek their involvement? in-put in planning, decision-making?)
parent initiative?

28. What have been your experiences with the community? What has worked and what has not? (What are examples of of school efforts or community efforts for involvement in school matters?

29. What has been the school's standing in the school system?

30. What are the experiences that have affected outside perception of the school negatively? positively?

31. What has been the role of the media? (favorable and unfavorable)

32. Is there evidence that students are being better prepared for life beyond high school? academically? higher education/ work? in civic responsibilities? socially? in lifestyle/ personally?

33. What are the constraints or pressures that you have felt either as an individual or with others when attempts have been made to make policy changes or enforce policies? from the outside? community? school system? laws? from inside?

INTERVIEW II

University Partner Interview

Directions: I'm going to ask you to reconstruct concrete details about your experiences in the form of stories that involve you and your relationships with other members of the school community.

What were your early involvements with the school like?

1. What was the nature of the activities (formally and informally)?

2. Did they involve students? staff? administration? parents/ community? others?

3. How often were you at the school site? are you there now?

4. With whom did you meet (formally and informally / with individuals and / or groups)?

What was it like being here the first year of the new administration? in the classroom? outside the classroom? outside the school?

5. What were the obstacles or constraints to change taking place?

6. Amidst all the problems, what did you perceive as the school's strengths?

What was going on between school staff (and others) and the "good students" of a positive nature? (academically? sports? school activities?enrichment programs? other?)

7. What were the first evidences of moving forward--that change was beginning to take place? (physical? attitudes?)

8. What did people do that indicated that change was beginning?

9. What did the headmaster do that affected people's attitudes?

What has been the extent of personal interaction of the partner representative with school constituencies? (involvement with individuals? planning committees? advisory committees?)

10. How have student services evolved over the years? What student issues do the university programs address?

11. What university contributions (human, material, financial, other) affect the teacher in the classroom, directly or indirectly?

12. How has the university partner been involved in whole school improvement issues:
    - parent/community
    - physical plant/material/financial
    - public perception?

INTERVIEW II

Parent Interview

Directions: I'm going to ask you to recount your experiences here in the form of stories thst involve you and your relationships with other members of the school community.

How did you come to be involved with this school?

1. Did you have a choice about sending your children here?
   When was that?

2. What did you know about the school?
   How did you come by that information?

3. What did you see as the problems that the school was experiencing?

What have been your experiences with the school?

4. What was the nature of your visits to the school?
   Were they planned activities by the school?
   Were you asked to attend conferences regarding your children?
   Did you take the initiative?

5. Have you been involved in activities working with other parents?
   Have you worked on any planning activities in the school?
   Have you worked with others? i.e., students?

6. What have those experiences been like?

7. What changes have you seen in the school over the years?
   within the school itself? in relating to the community?
   in the attitudes of people who work here?

8. What kinds of services have affected your children here?
   What has affected them academically? personally (if they've

had personal problems? socially (in relating to other students)? in community activities? in preparing them for work or higher education?

What reaction do you get from people outside the school about having your children attending this school?

9. What kinds of things affect what people from the outside know about the school? (positively and negatively)

What has been the role of the media?

10. What kinds of happenings make the news? (positively as well as negatively?)

INTERVIEW III

Headmaster Interview

Directions: Given what you said in your last interview about the details of your experiences, I'm going to ask you what those experiences mean to you.

1. When you first arrived, how did you see the physical setting influencing people negatively? And with changes, how were attitudes affected?

2. You spoke of your understanding of the problems of the school: how did you go about setting priorities in addressing the needs of so many?

3. Do you feel that you had a plan for revitalizing the school and the people associated with it?

4. How did you determine who to put in key leadership positions? What were their styles and strengths?

5. How and when do staff get together with their peers to discuss school issues? formally? informally? How much is self-initiated? How do you provide the opportunities?

6. How do you foster interactive processes among teachers? between teachers and administration? between teachers and students? with the university and business partners?

7. How do you feel that you convey to teachers that you identify with their roles in the classroom?

8. How do you encourage leadership in teachers?

9. Given the number of activities that take place outside the classroom, how does the added responsibility affect staff?

Why do they do it? How much is self-initiated? administratively-initiated? mandated? self-interest?

10. How have school activities affected staff attitudes toward each other? toward students? toward the university / business partners?

11. Why do staff choose to be here? How much of staff turnover is voluntary now? What are the involuntary reasons?

12. You described students when you first arrived nine years ago. Do you feel you had a plan for improving student morale? How did you go about it?

13. How have in-house resources affected students? academically? Personally? socially?

14. How have peer support groups affected students?

15. How have school activities affected student attitudes toward each other? toward the community? toward staff?

16. How do you see students effecting change themselves in the school? with their peers? in the community? in affecting public perception? in the school system?

17. What is the role of others in supporting that? staff? administration? the university/business partners? others?

18. How do you see staff being affected by their own involvement in these support programs and activities?

19. How have you seen cultural diversity (staff and students) affect people within the school? outsiders?

20. How have you seen parent involvement change over the years? What has contributed to that?

21. Why do parents want to send their children here? What accounts for them not wanting to send them here?

22. How has been the role of the community in the school changed over the years? What has worked and what has not?

23 What do you see as the value of the university partnership to students? teachers? the school? administration?

24. To what do you attribute the growth of the partnership? What are its strengths and weaknesses (relative to the above constituencies)? Why have they remained active supporters?

25. What do you see as the value of the business partnership to students? teachers? the school? administration?

26. To what do you attribute the growth of the partnership? What are its strengths and weaknesses (relative to the above constituencies)? Why have they remained active supporters?

27. How does the school prepare students for life? academically? personally? socially? emotionally? civicly? Who is involved?

28. Why do students choose to be here?

29. Did you have a plan for changing public perception of the school? How did that evolve?

39. How has a change in public perception affected the school and the people associated with it?

40. How do you feel you build "organizational patriotism"--commitment to the work of the school--in staff? in students? in the university/business partners? others?

41. How would you describe your job--your role--here? How do you feel you communicate what your vision is for students? for staff? for the school as a whole? What has your job meant to you? Where do you go from here? Why do you choose to stay?

INTERVIEW III

Teacher Interview

Directions: Given what you have said in the last interview about the details of your experiences, I'm going to ask you what those experiences mean to you.

1. Back in the 70's to early 80's, what reaction did you get from outsiders about working here?

2. After all the problems you had experienced, why did you choose to stay? Were there people involved in making that decision (students, peers, administration, family)?

3. How did you cope on a day-to-day basis in those troubled times? Who or what kept you going?

4. How did the physical condition of the building affect you and the people in it? and the surrounding community?

5. How did the unsettling climate affect you in the classroom? How did it affect relationships in the school? with outsiders?

6. Why was there a lack of support services for students?

7. Why were there limited internal (external) resources for support to students? for teachers?

8. Why did student behavior problems manifest themselves as they did?

9. Why was there a lack of formal communication among staff? between staff and administration? between school and others? lack of informal communication?

10. In discussing early attempts at addressing problems, most efforts did not work. Why not? Why was it difficult to sustain change efforts?

11. Why did change begin to take place?

12. Why did student behavior begin to change?
How did it change in the classroom? outside the classroom?
in their relationships with others?

    Why did staff attitudes change?

13. How have you seen students affected by in-house support services?

14. How did in-house support services begin? (outside mandate? administrative initiative? staff inititiative?)

15. How have you seen students affected by university resources?

16. How have you seen students affected by business resources?

17. How would you describe school efforts to keep students in school? get them to pass each year/to graduate? go on to higher education/work? personally? socially? in civic responsibilities?

18. How have you seen students affected by out-of-the-classroom activities? (positively and negatively)

19. Given the number of activities that take place outside the classroom, how does this added responsibility affect staff? Why do they do it? How much is self-initiated? administratively-initiated? initiated by others? mandated? is there any self-interest? (to combat the isolation of the classroom).

20. What is the value of these activities for people (staff, students, administration, the university/business partners, community, parents, others)?

21. How have you seen the demographics change over the years? (staff and students) How have you seen cultural diversity affecting people within and with outsiders?

22. How and when do staff get together with their peers to address school issues? with the administration? others? formally/informally?
How much is self-initiated? How does the administration provide the opportunities?

23. How have the university / business partnerships affected you as a teacher? (personal/professional development? providing services to enrich your classroom activities?)

24. How has the university partner provided resources that have enabled the school to effect changes internally and with outsiders? (human resources? financial? other?)

25. How has the business partner provided resources that have enabled the school to effect changes internally and with outsiders? (human resources? financial? other?)

26. What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the partnerships? If there are constraints, why?

27. Why have the university / business partners remained active supporters of the school?

28. Why do parents want to send their children here?
Why don't parents want to send their children here?

29. What accounts for the gains that have been made in narrowing the communication gap with people outside the school?

30. How has the school gone about changing public perception?

31. How has a change in public perception affected the school and the people in it and associated with it?

32. Do you get a different reaction now from outsiders about working here? Why?

33. Do you feel that you have the power to effect change here? To what extent? In what areas? How do you know that?

34. Do you have a sense of what the headmaster wants for students? How does he communicate that vision? for staff? for the school as a whole? for parents and community? for the university/business partners?

35. Do you have a sense of what he feels his role is as headmaster? How does he communicate that?

36. In describing the troubled 70's, teachers and students have been described as evidencing "low morale". How would describe the high points and the low points of morale over the past nine years? How is it evidenced? Who or what were the influences?

37. What do you see as the problems still to be addressed related to students? to teachers/staff? parents and community? university/business partnerships? administration?

38. Why do you choose to be here now?
Where do you see yourself going in the future?

INTERVIEW III

Parent Interview

Directions: Given what you have said in your last interview, I'm going about the details of your experiences, I'm going to ask you what those experiences mean to you.

1. Why did your first child come here? and your second?

2. How did you get your information about the school? How did you feel about what was going on inside the school?

3. How did you see the school helping your children academically? in their personal lives?

4. How did you see the school preparing your children for life? work or higher education? socially?

5. How did you get together with people in the school? teachers? the administration? other staff? other parents? others?

6. How did you feel when you came here?

7. How have you seen the school change over the years? Why do you think changes have taken place?

8. What is public opinion of the school now? What has caused that to change?

9. What do you still see as the problems that the school has to address? related to students? staff? parents? community?

10. What advice would you give to make further improvements?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ascher, C. (1988, December). School- college collaborations: A strategy for helping low-income minorities. Eric Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Barth, R. (1986). On sheep and goats and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 293-296.

Barth, R. (1990). Improving schools from within. United States: Josey-Bass.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Best, J. W. (1989). Research in education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal (2d ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1971). Educational research. New York: Longman.

Boston Secondary Schools Project, University of Massachusetts, Spring semester 1982, Jeremiah E. Burke High School, School-based Team Project Report.

Bowen, E. (1988, February 1) . Getting tough. Time Magazine, pp. 5-58.

Boyer, E. L. (1983) . High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Brandt, R. (1990) . Changing schools--But how? Educational Leadership, 48, 3.

Burns, J. (1978) . Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Chapelle, T. (1989, March / April) . The benevolent dictatorship of Joe Clark. The Black Collegian, pp. 68-70.

Clark, J. with Picard, J. (1989) . Laying down the law. Washington D.C: Regency Gateway.

Comer, J. P. (1988) . Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, 259, 42-48.

Cook, D. R., & LaFleur, N. K. (1975) . A guide to educational research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Deal, T. E. (1987). The culture of schools. In L. T. Sheive and M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the Elusive (pp.3-15). Alexandria, Va: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

_____(1985). National Commissions: Blueprints for remodeling or ceremonies for revitalizing public schools. Education and Urban Society, 17, 145-156.

Deal, T. E. & Kennedy, A. A. (1982) . Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Dwyer, D., Barnett, B., & Lee, G. (1987). The school principal: Scapegoat or the last great hope? In L. T. Sheive and M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the Elusive (pp. 30-46). Alexandria, Va: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dwyer, D., Less, G., Burnett, B., Filby, B., & Rowan, B. (1984). Frances Hedges and Orchard Park Elementary School: Instructional Leadership in a Stable Urban Setting. San Francisco: Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development.

Foster, A.. (1991). When teachers initiate restructuring. Educational Leadership, 48, 27-30.

Fullan, M. G. & Park, P. (1981). Curriculum Implementation: A resource booklet. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Fullan, M. G. & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The New Meaning of Educational Change. (2nd ed.) New York: Teachers College Press.

Gifford, B. (1986). The evolution of the school-university partnership for educational renewal. Education and Urban Society, 19, 77-106.

Goldman, C. & O'Shea, C. (1990). A culture for change. Educational Leadership, 47, 41-43.

Goodlad, J. (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gross, R., & B. (1985). The great school debate. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Guild, P. B. (1987) . How leaders minds work. In L. Sheive and M. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the Elusive (pp. 8-92). Alexandria, Va: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hall, G. E. & Loucks, S. (1977) . A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14 (3), 263-76.

Jones, B. L., & Maloy, R. W. (1988) . Partnerships for improving schools. New York: Greenwood Press.

Jones, B. L., & Maloy, R. W. (198). Collaborations and ill-structured problems of school improvement. Planning and Changing. 3-7.

Lieberman, A. (1988) . Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lightfoot, S. (1983) . The good high school. New York: Basic Books.

Lipsitz, J. (1983) . Successful schools for young adolescence. New York: Transaction Press.

Louis, K., & Miles, M. B. (1990) . Improving the urban high school: What works and why. New York: Teachers College Press.

Maloy, R. W., & Fischetti, J. (1986) . School-improvement teams: A qualitative assessment. Educational Horizons, 63, 18-21.

Maslow, A. (1954) . Motivation and personality. New York: Harper-Row.

McGregor, (1960) . The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miles, M. (1987) . Practical guidelines for school administrators: How to get there. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual meeting.

Owens, R. G. (1987) . The leadership of educational clans. In L. T. Sheive and M. B. Schoenheit (eds.), Leadership: Examining the Elusive (pp. 16-29). Alexandria, Va.: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982) . In search of excellence. New York: Harper and Row.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association . (1983). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rutter, M., Maughan, P., Mortimer, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979) . Fifteen thousand hours . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sarason, S. (1982) . The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Seidman, I. E. (1991) . Interviewing as qualitative research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1987) . The theoretical basis for cultural leadership. In L. T. Sheive and M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the Elusive (pp. 116-129). Alexandria, Va: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sheive, L. T. & Schoenheit, M. B. (1987) . Vision and the work life of educational leaders. In L. T. Sheive and M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the Elusive (pp. 93-104). Alexandria, Va: Association For Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sizer, T. R. (1985) . Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the american high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Sosniak, L. (1989) . Partnerships with a purpose . New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Tye, B. B. (1985) . Multiple realities. United States: University Press.

Tye, K., & Tye B. B. (1984) . Teacher isolation and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 48, 319-322.

Vacca, R., & J. L. (1989) . Content area reading. (3rd ed.) Kent State University: Harper Collins.

Vail, P. (1984) . The purposing of high performing systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni and J. E. Connolly (Eds.), Education and Organizational Structures. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Vivian, J. F. (1986) . Issues in establishing and developing an educational Collaboration: The Yale / New Haven experience. Education and Urban Society, 19, 59-76.

Webster's seventh new collegiate dictionary. (1967). Ill.: Merriam-Webster.

Yin, R. (1984) . Case study research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.